

225

THE
TWO LAWS
AS SET FORTH
IN THE SCRIPTURES
OF THE
Old and New Testaments.

BY
ELD. D. M. CANRIGHT.



STEAM PRESS
OF THE SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTIST PUBLISHING ASSOCIATION.
BATTLE CREEK, MICH.
1876.

Publications—Continued.

DATE OF THE SEVENTY WEEKS. By J. N. Andrews. 10 cts.

VINDICATION OF THE TRUE SABBATH. By J. W. Mortol. 10 cts.

MATTHEW TWENTY-FOUR By James White. 10 cts.

THE HOPE OF THE GOSPEL. By J. N. Loughborough. 10 cts.

SERMON ON THE TWO COVENANTS. By J. N. Andrews. 10 cts.

AN APPEAL TO THE BAPTISTS, from the Seventh-day Baptists, for the Restoration of the Bible Sabbath. 10 cts.

MILTON ON THE STATE OF THE DEAD. 5 cts.

FOUR-CENT TRACTS: The Law and the Gospel—The Seventh Part of Time—Celestial Railroad—Samuel and the Witch of Endor—The Ten Commandments not Abolished—Address to the Baptists—The Present Truth—The Second Advent—The Sufferings of Christ—The Two Thrones, Representing the Kingdoms of Grace and Glory—Spiritualism a Satanic Delusion—The Seventh-day Adventists; Their Origin, Principles and Progress.—The Two Covenants.

THREE-CENT TRACTS: Much in Little—The Lost-Time Question—Infidel Cavils Considered—The End of the Wicked—Scripture References—Argument on Sabbath—Who Changed the Sabbath?

TWO-CENT TRACTS: Definite Seventh Day—Seven Reasons for Sunday-Keeping Examined—Sabbath by Elihu—The Rich Man and Lazarus—The Millennium—Departing and Being with Christ—The Sanctuary of the Bible—The Judgment, or the Waymarks of Daniel to the Holy City—The Two Laws—Spirit of Prophecy.

ONE-CENT TRACTS: Appeal on Immortality—Brief Thoughts on Immortality—Thoughts for the Candid—Sign of the Day of God—Geology and the Bible—Without Excuse—Perfection of the Ten Commandments—The Coming of the Lord—Which Day, and God's Answers.

Works in Other Languages.

The Association also publishes works on some of the above-named subjects in the German, French, Danish, Swedish, and Holland languages.

Any of the foregoing works will be sent by mail to any part of the United States, post-paid, on receipt of the prices above stated. Full Catalogues sent gratis, on application.

** Address,

REVIEW & HERALD,

BATTLE CREEK, MICH.

CATALOGUE

Of Books, Pamphlets, Tracts, &c., Issued by the Seventh-Day Adventist Publishing Association.

THE ADVENT REVIEW & HERALD OF THE SABBATH, weekly. Terms, \$2.00 a year, in advance.

THE YOUTH'S INSTRUCTOR, monthly, devoted to moral and religious instruction. Terms, 50 cts. a year, in advance.

THE HEALTH REFORMER, monthly, devoted to an exposition of the laws of life, etc. Terms, \$1.00 a year, in advance.

THE ADVENT TIDENDE, a religious monthly in the Danish language. Terms, \$1.00 a year, in advance.

THE SVENSK ADVENT HAROLD, a religious monthly in the Swedish tongue. Terms, \$1.00 a year, in advance.

HYMN AND TUNE BOOK.—536 hymns—147 tunes. \$1 00.

THE HISTORY OF THE SABBATH AND FIRST DAY OF THE WEEK. By J. N. Andrews. 528 pp., \$1.25.

THE CHRISTIAN LIFE AND PUBLIC LABORS OF WM. MILLER, the noted Lecturer and Writer upon the Prophecies. \$1.00.

THOUGHTS ON THE BOOK OF DANIEL, critical and practical. By U. Smith. Bound, \$1.00; condensed edition, paper, 35 cts.

THOUGHTS ON THE REVELATION, critical and practical. By U. Smith. 328 pp., \$1.00.

THE NATURE AND DESTINY OF MAN. By U. Smith. 384 pp., bound, \$1.00, paper, 40 cts.

THE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT: or a Discussion between W. H. Littlejohn and the editor of the *Christian Statesman* on the Sabbath question. \$1.00.

THE SPIRIT OF PROPHECY. By Mrs. E. G. White. \$1.00.

LIFE OF ELDER JOSEPH BATES. \$1 25.

THE GAME OF LIFE, with notes. Three illustrations, 5x6 inches each, representing Satan playing with man for his soul. In board, 50 cts., in paper, 30 cts.

(POEM.) A WORD FOR THE SABBATH: or False Theories Exposed. By U. Smith. 3d ed. revised and enlarged. 40 cts.

THE UNITED STATES IN PROPHECY. By U. Smith. Bound, 50 cts.; paper, 25 cts.

PROGRESSIVE BIBLE LESSONS for Youth, in boards, 50 cts.

" " " Children, " 35 cts.

(See third page of cover.)

Center for Adventist Research

Andrews University

Benien Springs, Michigan

THE

TWO LAWS

AS SET FORTH

IN THE SCRIPTURES

OF THE

Old and New Testaments.

BY

ELD. D. M. CANRIGHT.

STEAM PRESS

OF THE SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTIST PUBLISHING ASSOCIATION.

BATTLE CREEK, MICH.

1876.



TO THE READER.—The question discussed in the following pages is one of fundamental importance. If the distinction between moral and ceremonial laws advocated in this work, really exists, to overlook this distinction is to come inevitably to wrong conclusions on the great subject of the law, and to involve the Bible in irreconcilable contradiction. We believe the reader will here find the testimony of the Scriptures on this subject, the only evidence entitled to any notice, clearly and impartially set forth.

PUBLISHERS.



Vault
BT
96
.C 358
c.4
Her.

THE TWO LAWS.

TEXTS. "Do we, then, make void the law through faith? God forbid: yea, we establish the law." Rom. 3:31.

"Having abolished in his flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances." Eph. 2:15.

Both these texts are in the New Testament, and both were written by the same apostle; yet one asserts that the law has been abolished by Christ, and the other declares as positively that the law has not been abolished. How is this seeming contradiction to be reconciled? By the simple fact that Paul is speaking of two entirely different laws. The first text relates to the decalogue; the second to the typical law.

But some of our opponents deny that there is any such distinction of laws. They claim that the Old Testament contains but one law; hence when Paul says that the law is abolished, he means all law is abolished. We freely admit that their conclusion is good if there be not two laws in the Old Testament. Numerous passages in the New Testament do clearly speak of the abolition of a law at the death of Christ. If the phrase, the law, embraces all the precepts of the Old Testament, if there were not two laws, then, not only the ceremonial law, but the ten commandments and all the moral precepts of the Old Testament were done away by Christ; for it is repeatedly taught that a law was abolished at his death. But the absurdity of such a conclu-

(3)

sion should itself cause us to stop and examine well our premises before we adopt it. Is it reasonable that God should abolish such precepts as these: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thine heart," "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself," "Thou shalt not kill," &c? These are in the Old Testament and have all been abolished if the law which was abolished embraced all the laws of the Old Testament.

We will now show that there were two systems of law running parallel from the fall of Adam to the death of Christ; and that then one expired while the other was confirmed and established.

In the beginning, man was placed upon probation under such conditions that he could have secured eternal life by simple obedience to God. Adam was placed in Eden and given free access to the tree of life and all the trees, except the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. Gen. 2: 8-17. As long as he could continue to eat of the tree of life, just so long he would live. Gen. 3: 22. To Adam the Lord said, "Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat; but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it; for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." Gen. 2:16, 17. Then the day of his death would not come till the day that he disobeyed God and ate of the forbidden fruit. Had he never disobeyed God he never would have died. But death came in consequence of sin, and so Paul says, "Wherefore, as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin." Rom. 5:12.

If, therefore, man had been obedient to his Creator, he would have secured eternal life by that obedience. Then Christ need not have died

to save men; and none of the types, shadows, and sacrifices of the Old Testament, pointing to the death of Christ, would ever have been instituted. But Adam and Eve disobeyed God, and thus became sinners. Gen. 3:1-6. By this act they broke God's moral law, and violated the principles of several of the ten commandments, as will soon appear. Look at the facts: The Lord gave them free access to everything but one tree which he forbade them to touch. But the tempter persuaded Eve to eat of it. "And when the woman saw that the tree was good for food, and that it was pleasant to the eyes, and a tree to be desired to make one wise, she took of the fruit thereof, and did eat; and gave also unto her husband with her, and he did eat." Gen. 3:6.

Eve looked at the fruit and saw that it was pleasant and much to be desired. In short, she began to covet it and thus violated the principle of the tenth commandment, "Thou shalt not covet." Next, she put forth her hand and took what did not belong to her, and thus broke the eighth commandment, "Thou shalt not steal." Further, by this act they obeyed the serpent and disobeyed God and thus violated the principle of the first commandment, "Thou shalt have no other Gods before me." Again, "Adam, which was the son of God," Luke, 3:38, disobeyed his father and thus violated the principle of the fifth commandment, "Honor thy father and thy mother."

Thus it will be seen that the first transgression did have a direct bearing upon the principles of the moral law as they were afterward embodied in the ten commandments. But was the decalogue given to Adam in Eden? Of course it was

not written out on tables or in a book, for men were not acquainted with writing till the days of Moses; but certainly the principles of the ten commandments all existed then, and probably the Lord orally instructed Adam touching them. Would it not have been a sin for Adam to worship a false god, or to bow down to an image, or to take God's name in vain? No candid person can deny these points. It is directly stated that the Sabbath commandment was given there. Gen. 2:1-3. But how could Adam dishonor his parents when he had none, or commit adultery when there was no woman but his own wife, or lie about his neighbor when he had none? Be it remembered that all these relations were anticipated at the creation of man, for right there the Lord instituted marriage and commanded them to multiply and fill the earth. Gen. 1:28. All the relations of parents and children, brethren, neighbors, &c., would and did immediately obtain according to the Lord's direction. Did not the Lord anticipate and make provision for all these relations? To say he did not is to charge God with negligence and folly.

Now, having disobeyed God and become sinners, it thereby became necessary that Christ should die to redeem and save fallen men. Hence the Redeemer was immediately promised, in the declaration that the seed of the woman should bruise the serpent's head. Gen. 3:15. And so it is said that Jesus was a lamb "slain from the foundation of the world." Rev. 13:8. But it was to be many ages before the Saviour would come; hence it became necessary to offer sacrifices as types and shadows of the death of Christ, thereby to show their faith in the coming Re-

deemer; also to confess thereby that they were condemned sinners. To offer a sacrifice they must have an altar upon which to offer it; they must have a priest properly set apart to officiate at the altar; this priest must be supported; and finally a temple with all its ceremonies became necessary. To regulate all these a law was necessary. Hence the introduction of the law relating to types and shadows, commonly called the ceremonial law.

The least reflection will show that this law never would have existed if man had not previously transgressed the other—the moral law. No precept relating to sacrifices, types, shadows, the priesthood, temple, &c., would ever have been given if man had not first broken the moral law and thus become a condemned sinner, needing a Saviour. Hence the second law was added to point to the promised seed till he should come. Paul is very clear upon this point. He says, "Wherefore, then, serveth the law? It was added because of transgressions, till the seed should come to whom the promise was made; and it was ordained by angels in the hand of a mediator." Gal. 3:19.

Why was this law given? "*Because of transgressions.*" Transgression is a violation of the law, 1 John 3:4; and "where no law is, there is no transgression." Rom. 4:15. But a law did exist and was transgressed before the ceremonial law was given, for Paul says "it was added *because of transgressions.*" Then the transgressions existed before this law was given; but there could be no transgression without a law to transgress. Hence the conclusion is inevitable that there was a law which existed and was vio-

lated before ever this law spoken of in Galatians had an existence. Furthermore, as transgression of a previous law was what brought this law into existence, it follows that if there had been no transgression this law would never have had an existence. This is just what I have already shown concerning the ceremonial law. It was necessarily brought into existence as soon as man became a sinner by the violation of the moral law. It pointed to the death of Christ, the seed that was to come. Hence Paul says, "It was added because of transgressions, *till the seed should come.*" Then it was not the moral law; for that does not point to Christ, nor say anything about the coming of the seed, while the law of sacrifices, types, and shadows, related wholly to that promised seed.

Many references to both these laws may be seen in Genesis. In Chap. 3:21, we learn that the Lord clothed Adam and Eve with skins. This intimates that beasts had been slain in sacrifice. Abel offered a sacrifice of the firstlings of his flock. Gen. 4:4. He did this by faith, as Paul tells us in Heb. 11:4. By this he showed his faith in the death of the Lamb of God who was to come. But the infidel Cain, having no faith in the coming of Christ, simply brought of the fruit of the ground a thank-offering. Gen. 4:3. This the Lord would not accept as it showed no faith in the coming Redeemer.

Noah built an altar and offered upon it burnt offerings. Gen. 8:20. So did Abraham. Gen. 12:7, 8. Melchizedek "was the priest of the most high God," Gen. 14:18, whom Abraham honored and to whom he paid tithes. Verse 20. This shows that at an early day the Lord had

regularly ordained priests and a law for their proper maintenance. Isaac offered sacrifices, Gen. 26:25; so did Jacob, Gen. 31:54.

These facts show that the Lord did give directions in the earliest ages to the patriarchs concerning sacrifices, altars, priests, &c., though we have no direct record of it, as no books were written at that time. But as soon as we come to where books were written, both the ceremonial and the moral law were written out fully.

References to the moral law, the ten commandments, are also found in Genesis. See Chap. 2:1-3; 4:8-11; 9:22-25; 20:6-9; 31:30-32; 35:1, 2; 39:17-20, &c. The sacredness of the seventh day is specially and prominently noticed in the very beginning. Gen. 2:1-3. The book of Genesis being a record of events which were all in the past when it was written, and the parties being all dead to whom it related, it was not necessary that it should contain a code of laws. But it is noticeable that as soon as the record reaches the time of the author—Moses—both laws are immediately written out in full, the moral law first, and the law of ordinances immediately after. See Ex. 19-30.

Notice in what a solemn and impressive manner the moral law was given. After the people had made special preparations for three days to meet with the Lord, he came down in great majesty upon Mount Sinai. "And it came to pass on the third day in the morning that there were thunders and lightnings, and a thick cloud upon the mount, and the voice of the trumpet exceeding loud; so that all the people that were in the camp trembled. And Moses brought forth the people out of the camp to meet with God; and

they stood at the nether part of the mount. And Mount Sinai was altogether on a smoke, because the Lord descended upon it in fire; and the smoke thereof ascended as the smoke of a furnace, and the whole mount quaked greatly." Ex. 19:16-19. Paul says that the Lord's voice then shook the earth. Heb. 12:26. Moses says, "And the Lord spake unto you out of the midst of the fire; ye heard the voice of the words but saw no similitude, only ye heard a voice. And he declared unto you his covenant, which he commanded you to perform, even ten commandments; and he wrote them upon two tables of stone." Deut. 4:12, 13.

Some have denied that the decalogue is ever called a law; but in this they contradict the plainest teaching of the Bible. Thus the Lord said to Moses, "Come up to me into the mount, and be there; and I will give thee *tables of stone*, and a *law*, and *commandments* which *I have written*, that thou mayest teach them." Ex. 24:12. What did God write? The ten commandments; nothing more nor less. That which the Lord wrote on tables of stone is here directly declared to be a law. So in Deut. 33:2, speaking of the descent of the Lord upon Mount Sinai, Moses says, "From his right hand went a fiery law for them." What went from God's right hand? The decalogue; and this is here again called a *law*. Moses is particular to mention the fact that when the Lord had spoken just the ten commandments, "*he added no more*; and he wrote them in two tables of stone." Deut. 5:22. This indicates that it was a complete law. And when Moses had broken the first tables, the Lord wrote just the same ten commandments the second time.

Deut. 10:1-5. This shows that the Lord had a design in selecting those commandments above any others.

All through the Bible the decalogue is referred to and quoted as "*the law*." Paul says, "I had not known lust, except *the law* had said, Thou shalt not covet." Rom. 7:7. This is the tenth commandment. Again Paul enjoins upon them to fulfill the law, and to show what he means by this he quotes the sixth, seventh, eighth, ninth, and tenth commandments of the decalogue. Rom. 13:8-10. So James quotes the sixth and seventh commandments and says that whoever violates these breaks *the law*. James 2:10-13. Numerous instances might be given where the term *law* is applied to the decalogue alone.

No other part of the Bible was given in the same manner, and no other portion was honored so highly as the ten commandments.

First, God spoke this law himself in the hearing of the whole nation with a great voice that shook the earth. He did not suffer it to be given through a prophet, nor even through an angel. It was so important that the Lord came down from heaven personally in the greatest majesty and delivered it himself. No other law was ever thus given.

Secondly, God wrote this holy law with his own finger. "The tables were the work of God, and the writing was the writing of God, graven upon the tables." Ex. 32:16. "Tables of stone, written with the finger of God." Ex. 31:18. The Lord also wrote it the second time. See Deut. 10:1-5. All the rest was written by the hands of men. But this law was too holy and too important to be written by sinful men. It is

the only document we have in the handwriting of Jehovah.

Thirdly, this law was engraved upon the enduring stone, indicating its unchangeable and imperishable nature. It was not intrusted to paper or parchment like other laws.

Fourthly, it was then deposited in the ark in the most holy place. Thus, Moses says, "And I turned myself and came down from the mount, and put the tables in the ark which I had made." Deut. 10:5. Again, "There was nothing in the ark, save the two tables of stone which Moses put there at Horeb." 1 Kings 8:9. No other law was thus honored. Why were the ten commandments thus singled out and honored above all other precepts? Our opponents are never able to explain this matter.

Look a moment at the nature of the law itself. Man's duty branches out in two directions: First, supreme love to the Creator; secondly, equal love to his neighbor. Hence, the law is divided into two parts, the first four commandments relating to our duty to God, and the last six to our duty to man.

First commandment: "Thou shalt have no other gods before me." If this commandment were kept it would banish all false gods from the world and secure the undivided worship of the true God.

Second commandment: "Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of anything that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the waters under the earth," &c. This forbids the *false* worship of the *true* God. If it were obeyed it would banish from the world all images and every false mod-

of worshipping God. The third commandment forbids us to profane God's name. This would stop all profanity and irreverence toward God. In all the world this holy name would ever be spoken with awe and reverence.

The fourth precept forbids all secular work upon the Creator's rest-day, the seventh day, and requires all to keep it holy to the Lord. What a glorious scene that would be were this commandment kept by all the world!

Next to our duty to God, is duty to our parents. Hence the second table begins with: "Honor thy father and thy mother." This would secure love and obedience to parents, and respect for the aged and to superiors. The sixth, "Thou shalt not kill," guards the life of our neighbor. The next, against adultery, guards the purity and chastity of every family. Then comes the one against theft, guarding every man's property. Then the one forbidding lying and enforcing truthfulness. And, finally, the tenth, against coveting that which is not ours.

Reader, if these commandments were all strictly kept by every one in all the world, this earth would be almost a Heaven itself! Oh! what a perfect law this is; worthy of its divine Author, and worthy of being given as it was. Well may the Psalmist exclaim, "Thy commandment is exceeding broad." Ps. 119:96. Then he says, "Open thou mine eyes, that I may behold wondrous things out of thy law." Ps. 119:18. And the wise man properly sums up every moral duty thus: "Let us hear the conclusion of the whole matter: Fear God, and keep his commandments, for this is the whole duty of man." Eccl. 12:13. The decalogue is an epitome of every moral duty.

There is no sin or crime which is not covered by some one of the ten commandments.

John M. Stearns, counselor at law, in an article in the *Christian Union*, Jan. 1, 1870, says: "The law libraries of the world, with their mixed dialects, and ancient lore, and mammoth tomes, innumerable reports, and multitudinous variety of discussions by men of judicial acumen and giant learning, do not give us one idea of crime or virtue, right or wrong, of the propensities or delinquencies of human life, beyond what is embodied in these sacred tables. Notwithstanding the ridicule sought to be thrown on a resolution of one of the early Legislatures of Connecticut, that God's law should be the law of the colony until special laws should be enacted by the government, or to that effect, it is believed that few cases arise claiming adjudications from our courts of law that would not be better determined by a careful respect to the commands of the decalogue."

It is simply a brief outline of moral principle. When they come to be carried out in all their bearings in the minutiae, of course a thousand explanations of them are necessary. To illustrate: Before me lies a Greek grammar. In the beginning of the book we have thirty-five rules governing words in every possible relation and combination. Then follows the whole body of the book of five hundred pages, re-stating and explaining these rules. As the student progresses, he finds that these few simple rules cover innumerable cases of which he never would have thought without an explanation. Many times it is very difficult to determine under just which rule a word does come. But there is no

word that does not come under some one of those few, simple rules.

So with the ten commandments. They are the ten great rules of God's moral government in this earth. They stand near the beginning of the Bible. Then follows the great body of God's book, explaining, illustrating, and enforcing these rules. Every writer, every prophet, every apostle, has thrown some additional light upon them, has made some new statement of their principles, as circumstances called them forth. Christ, the great Teacher, did this more than any before him. See his explanation of the sixth and seventh commandments. Matt. 5:21-28. He says that anger in the heart is a violation of the precept, "Thou shalt not kill," and that lust in the heart is a violation of the precept against adultery. This always had been true, though not as clearly stated in this form till that time. The same principle is stated in Prov. 6:25.

THE LAW OF TYPES AND SHADOWS.

We have previously shown that, in the nature of things, there is a distinction between moral and ceremonial precepts, the latter being made necessary by man's violation of the former. And, while God himself spoke the decalogue, the ceremonial law was given through angels to Moses, who wrote it out in a book of parchment. Of this Paul says, "For if the word spoken by angels was steadfast," &c. Heb. 2:2. Again, Of the typical law he says, "It was ordained by angels in the hand of a mediator." Gal. 3:19. The first formal law written regulating the typical service, the sacrifices, the altar, the temple, the

priesthood, &c., may be found beginning with Ex. 25, and extending through the book of Leviticus. It follows immediately after the giving of the moral law. Moses went up into the mount and was there several weeks receiving and writing out this law in a book. Ex. 24: 15-18. This is to the ceremonial system what the decalogue is to the moral.

It is noticeable that the great moral law of ten commandments is first given and the covenant concerning it solemnly ratified. Exodus, chapter 19 to the 8th verse of chapter 24. Then the following chapters contain an epitome of everything relating to the typical system. Afterward the Lord gave a great many explanations and illustrations of how this law was to be applied and carried out. The teachers and prophets from Moses till Christ each added some further light and instruction touching the nature and design of these types, as the circumstances called them forth.

Thus, the Lord sends a message to his people through a prophet. Part of it relates to their moral duties, and a part to their typical service, as the occasion demands. The book of Malachi is an example. So, interspersed all through the teachings of the Old Testament are many and frequent instructions touching the ceremonial law. At the same time interspersed with these are many instructions relating to the carrying out of the moral law in moral duties. Almost every book in the Old Testament furnishes an example of this. A careless reader might class them all together as different parts of the same law.

To illustrate: Here stands a large, thrifty ap-

ple tree, with heavy foliage, and much fruit. Growing right up by its trunk is a large hop vine which has spread all through and over the branches of the tree. The hop vine is full of hops. A person who had never seen an apple tree nor a hop vine would think that both were but one tree. But, though the limbs and vines are closely intertwined together in a thousand folds, they are all the time and everywhere entirely distinct. One is a tree, the other a vine. One is sweet, the other bitter. One is enduring, the other dies in a summer. The vine is supported by the tree. This illustrates the connection between the moral and the typical law. The apple tree (the moral law) was planted in Eden. It then had but few branches and light foliage. Immediately after the fall, the hop vine (ceremonial system) was planted by its side. At that time, this was also small. Both grew together through the patriarchal age, every year adding to their growth. During the Jewish age both grew rapidly, each developing many new branches, shoots, and leaves, and bearing much fruit. Finally, the tree (the moral law) became overgrown and much encumbered by the vine (the ceremonial law). Then Christ appeared. At one stroke, by his death upon the cross, he cut up the hop vine by the roots, but watered the apple tree with his own blood. The vine now soon withered and died; the leaves faded and fell off; and the winds blew down the rotten vines. Then the apple tree appeared in all its beauty, and the tree was loaded with fruit. So, from Adam to Christ, both laws were continually being taught and enforced by all God's servants. But, at the death of Christ, the ceremonial ended

and soon passed away; but the law of God, with all the moral precepts and teachings in the Old Testament branching out from it, was confirmed, received new life, and further explanations from Christ and the apostles.

DISTINCTION IN THE GIVING OF THE TWO LAWS.

Evidently, the Lord designed to mark a plain distinction between the two laws in the manner in which he gave them to the people. As we have seen, the decalogue was given in the following manner: 1. God himself spoke it from heaven with his own voice. Ex. 19:16-19; Deut. 4:12, 13. 2. The Lord wrote it twice with his own finger. Ex. 31:18; 32:16; Deut. 10:1-5. 3. He engraved it upon stone. Ex. 32:16. 4. It was placed in the ark under the cherubim in the most holy place. Ex. 25:16, 22; Deut. 10:1-5.

Now notice how differently the other law was given: 1. Moses went up into the mount alone, where, being instructed by an angel, he wrote it out with his own hand. See Ex. 24:15-18; Deut. 31:9, 24. And so Paul says, "It was ordained by angels in the hand of a mediator." Gal. 3:19. Hence also it is called "the handwriting of ordinances." Col. 2:14. For the same reason it is often called "the law of Moses," Acts 15:5, not because Moses was the author of the law, but because the Lord gave it through Moses. The Lord was the real author of the law, but Moses was the medium through whom it was made known to the people. Hence it is some-

times called "the law of the Lord," and sometimes "the law of Moses." See Luke 2:22, 23, where both terms are used. But mark this fact: *The ten commandments are never in a single instance called the law of Moses.*

2. Moses wrote the ceremonial law in a book of parchment. Deut. 31:24. 3. Moses spoke this law to the people. Deut. 1:3-5; 31:1; 32:45, 46. "And Moses made an end of speaking all these words to all Israel. And he said unto them, Set your hearts unto all the words which I testify among you this day, which ye shall command your children to observe to do, all the words of this law." Deut. 32:45, 46. 4. This book of the law was then put, not *into* the ark, but *by* the side, as Dr. Horne renders it. "And it came to pass when Moses had made an end of writing the words of this law in a book, until they were finished, that Moses commanded the Levites which bare the ark of the covenant of the Lord, saying, Take this book of the law, and put it in the side of the ark of the covenant." Deut. 31:24-26.

Thus we see that there was one law in the ark and another outside the ark; one law on the tables of stone, another in the book; one law written by God, another by Moses; one law spoken by God, another by Moses; one law relating to moral duties, and another to ceremonial ordinances. Who will deny the existence of two laws when the distinction is so plain? And this distinction is everywhere kept up, both in the Old and in the New Testament. Thus, in 2 Kings 21:8, the Lord says, "Neither will I make the feet of Israel move any more out of the land which I gave their fathers; only if they will ob-

serve to do according to all that I have commanded them, and according to all the law that my servant Moses commanded them." Here the Lord makes a plain distinction between what he himself had commanded them and what Moses had commanded them. The same fact is distinctly mentioned in Neh. 9: 13, 14: "Thou camest down also upon Mount Sinai, and spakest with them from heaven, and gavest them right judgments, and true laws, good statutes and commandments, and madest known unto them thy holy Sabbath." We know that this refers to the ten commandments, for the Lord did come down upon Sinai and speak them from heaven, while no other law was thus given. Notice the character ascribed to this law. It is called "*right*," "*true*," and "*good*."

After describing this holy law which God gave, then the prophet adds, "and commandedst them precepts, statutes, and laws, by the hand of Moses, thy servant." Here we have, first, one set of "judgments," "laws," "statutes," and "commandments" spoken to them by the voice of God. Then, secondly, another set of "precepts," "statutes," and "laws" by the hand of Moses. This makes it certain that there were two laws given to the people.

Turning to Eze. 20 we have still further proof of this fact. Says the Lord, "Wherefore I caused them to go forth out of the land of Egypt, and brought them into the wilderness; and I gave them my statutes, and showed them my judgments, which, if a man do, he shall even live in them." Verses 10, 11. Then follows a rehearsal of how they rebelled and would not obey the law of God. "Because they had not executed my

judgments, but had despised my statutes, and had polluted my Sabbaths [the fourth commandment], and their eyes were after their fathers' idols [the first and second commandments], wherefore I gave them also statutes that were not good, and judgments whereby they should not live." Verses 24, 25.

First, the Lord gave them a law by which they might live. They broke this; then he gave them, *also*, in addition, one whereby they could not live, one that was "*not good*." This shows that a second law was added to the first because of a violation of the first. While the first law is called "*right*," "*true*," and "*good*," of the other law it is positively affirmed that it was "*not good*." The careful observance of all the rites and ceremonies of the law of ordinances was always a grievous yoke for them to bear. The Lord himself says it was not good; yet their sins made it a necessity. Is the same law good and not good at the same time? Is the same law one by which they can live and by which they can not live? How absurd. No. There were two different laws, different in every respect, and so recognized in all the Bible. Thus the Lord says, through Jeremiah, "Put your burnt-offerings unto your sacrifices, and eat flesh. For I spake not unto your fathers, nor commanded them in the day that I brought them out of the land of Egypt, concerning burnt-offerings or sacrifices; but this thing commanded I them, saying, Obey my voice, and I will be your God, and ye shall be my people." Jer. 7: 21-23. Turning back to where the Lord gave the decalogue, we find these very words used concerning it. Ex. 19: 1-8.

Afterward God gave them another law concerning sacrifices.

In the New Testament we find the same distinction recognized. "But there rose up certain of the sect of the Pharisees which believed, saying, That it was needful to circumcise them and to command them to keep the law of Moses." Acts 15:5. Circumcision is the question, and the law regulating it is called "the law of Moses." But Paul says, "I had not known lust, except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet." Rom. 7:7. This law he immediately calls "the law of God." Verse 22.

SPECIAL LAWS.

Besides the two great systems of law above described—the moral and the ceremonial—notice should also be taken of certain special laws granted to the Jews for a limited time. They do not really belong either to the moral or typical laws. The Jewish government was a theocracy. God himself was their king, and hence they were supposed to be governed wholly by his moral laws; and in most cases they were, as an examination of their laws will show. See Lev. 19 as an example. But their manners and morals had become greatly corrupted by a long residence among a heathen people. Hence it was not possible immediately to reform them from all their heathen customs and bring them up in all things to a purely moral standard. Hence special precepts had to be made governing abuses which could not be corrected. Take the law of divorce as an example. Of this law Jesus says, "Moses, because of the hardness of your hearts, suffered you to put away your wives; but from

the beginning it was not so." Matt. 19:8. So they were permitted to own slaves. Ex. 21. But this was never pleasing to God. See Isa. 58; Jer. 34. These and other practices, such as polygamy, etc., were a violation of the moral law. Hence, when Jesus came, the people being now more enlightened, he summarily set all such precepts aside, and brought every act strictly to the test of God's moral law. See Matt. 5:17-48.

WHAT LAW WAS ABOLISHED?

We are now prepared to show that the law of Moses, the ceremonial law, relating to the whole typical system of the Old Testament, such as the priesthood, the sacrifices, circumcision, etc., etc., together with those civil precepts which God granted on account of their blindness and hardness of heart, of which we have spoken before, was abolished at the cross, and that these were the only laws abolished there. Every passage which speaks of a law being done away refers to these, never to the ten commandments or any moral precept or teaching of the Old Testament. The whole typical system pointed directly to Christ. Col. 2:14-17. When he came, in the very nature of things, it must cease. But why should any moral precept be done away there? There is neither reason nor Scripture for such a position. We will take every passage in order which speaks of the abolition of any law.

MATTHEW 5.

In Matt. 5, Jesus first teaches the unchangeable nature of the ten commandments, verses 17-28.

Then he takes up some of the precepts of the civil law of the Jews, given to them by Moses, and emphatically sets them all aside. Thus: "It hath been said [this may be found, not in the decalogue, but in the law of Moses, Deut. 24:1], Whosoever shall put away his wife, let him give her a writing of divorcement. But I say unto you, That whosoever shall put away his wife, saving for the cause of fornication, causeth her to commit adultery." Verses 31, 32. It will readily be seen that this law is neither a part of the decalogue nor yet of the typical law. It really permitted a violation of the seventh commandment. As we have seen, the time had now come for these special precepts to be set aside. Hear Jesus further: "Again, ye have heard that it hath been said by them of old time, Thou shalt not forswear thyself, but shalt perform unto the Lord thine oaths [this is found in Num. 30:2]; but I say unto you, Swear not at all." Matt. 5:33, 34. This again belongs, not to the moral law, nor to the law of types and shadows, but to the civil law of the Jews which was permitted them for a limited time. Jesus continues: "Ye have heard that it hath been said, An eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth; but I say unto you, That ye resist not evil; but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also." Matt. 5:38, 39. This is no part of the ten commandments, but is found in the civil law of the Jews.

And so every item which he names in this chapter as being done away is found in the law of Moses, relating to those permissions granted them in the civil law.

LUKE 16:16.

"The law and the prophets were until John."
Luke 16:16.

The position taken upon this text, that the law existed only till the days of John, furnishes a good illustration of the blindness and unreasonableness of error. If it is sound, then the law was abolished in the days of John the Baptist, several years before the cross. Well, then, was it abolished again at the death of Christ? So our opponents claim. It would seem that the law died hard indeed! If the old law was abolished in the days of John, and the new law did not come into force till after the death of Christ, then there was a period of some years in which there was no law at all, as the old was dead and the new was not yet given! And, further, not only was the law abolished in the time of John, but the prophets were abolished too! For the text says, "*The law and the prophets were until John.*" If this proves that the law was abolished there, it proves the same of the prophets! A position so absurd cannot be true.

But what, then, is the meaning of the text? I understand it to be this: The people were taught by the law and the prophets till John came; then they had the additional light of the gospel of the kingdom. Matthew renders it thus: "For all the prophets and the law *prophesied* until John." Chap. 11:13. Luke gives it thus: "The law and the prophets were until John; since that time the kingdom of God is preached, and every man presseth into it." Chap. 16:16. If the reader will look into his Bible, he will see that "*were*" is a supplied word, not in

the original. The context must show what words are to be supplied. "*Were preached*" are manifestly the proper words to be supplied, as the last part of the verse shows. It would then read thus: "The law and the prophets were preached until John; since that time the kingdom of God is preached." Matthew also harmonizes with this, as will be seen. Then the simple meaning is, not that the law and the prophets all died at the coming of John, but that these were preached as the only light the people had till then; and after that they had the additional light of the gospel. This text, then, says nothing about the abolition of any law.

ACTS 15.

Acts 15 is always appealed to as teaching the abolition of the ten commandments, so we will examine it: "And certain men which came down from Judea, taught the brethren, and said, Except ye be circumcised after the manner of Moses, ye cannot be saved. When, therefore, Paul and Barnabas had no small dissension and disputation with them, they determined that Paul and Barnabas, and certain other of them, should go up to Jerusalem, unto the apostles and elders about this question." Verses 1, 2. It is plainly stated what the question was, viz, circumcision. Notice that Paul and Barnabas go up to this council on purpose to have this question settled. In his letter to the Galatians he refers to this. Chap. 2:1-23. "But there rose up certain of the sect of the Pharisees which believed, saying, That it was needful to circumcise them, and to command them to keep the law of Moses." Verse 5. Is this the decalogue? No, indeed. It is expressly

said to be the law of Moses relating to circumcision.

A great council of all the apostles and leading brethren was called at Jerusalem to consider this question. Verses 1-6. After much discussion Peter arose and said, "Why tempt ye God, to put a yoke upon the neck of the disciples, which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear?" Verse 10. The ceremonial law, with its rites, its washings, its distinctions of clean and unclean, and its sacrifices, was indeed a difficult law to observe. It might well be termed "a yoke." Of it the Lord had said, "I gave them also statutes that were not good, and judgments whereby they should not live." Eze. 20:25. To this law Peter refers.

Are the ten commandments a yoke grievous to be borne? Look at them. 1. Have no gods but the Lord. Is this a yoke of bondage? Who dare affirm it? 2. Do not worship an image. Did the disciples find it grievous to obey this? Did they want liberty to disobey it? 3. Do not profane God's name. Was this a yoke hard to bear? Skip the Sabbath. 5. Honor your parents. Is this the galling yoke? 6. Do not kill. 7. Nor commit adultery. 8. Nor steal. 9. Nor lie. 10. Nor covet. Where do we find a hard yoke, in any of these, which ought to be thrown off? No, it is not there. Then it must be the Sabbath, if in the decalogue at all. But is it a hard thing to rest upon God's sacred day and give him one day out of seven? But that was not the subject about which they were troubled. It was circumcision, concerning which there is not one word in the whole decalogue.

After thoroughly discussing this question, the

apostles wrote to the Gentiles thus: "Forasmuch as we have heard, that certain which went out from us have troubled you with words, subverting your souls, saying, Ye must be circumcised, and keep the law; to whom we gave no such commandment. . . . It seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us, to lay upon you no greater burden than these necessary things: that ye abstain from meats offered to idols, and from blood, and from things strangled, and from fornication; from which if ye keep yourselves, ye shall do well." Acts 15:24-29.

There, says one, the apostles have enumerated and brought over into the gospel all that it was necessary to keep of the old law. But they do not mention the Sabbath; therefore it is not binding. Profound conclusion! Look again. They do not say a word about swearing, lying, stealing, murdering, or coveting. Therefore these are not to be obeyed any longer! Indeed, not one of the ten commandments is mentioned at all. Every item enumerated is found in either the ceremonial or the civil law. The meats offered to idols were food set before an idol and then removed to be eaten by men. Blood, and things strangled were forbidden by the Levitical law. Lev. 17:13-16. Fornication was, no doubt, one of the minor branches embraced in the seventh commandment; but there was a civil law directly mentioning and prohibiting it. Lev. 19:29; Deut. 23:17. Notice that this was not done away, but retained because it had a bearing upon the moral law.

Notice this important fact: The great question before the apostles was whether or not a certain law was still to be kept by Christians. Verses

5-24. They decide that it is not, with the exception of four points which they enumerate. So much of that law which they here select out should still be observed. All the rest is to be disregarded. If, therefore, the ten commandments and the moral precepts of the Old Testament are included in the law here under discussion, then Christians can lie, steal, covet, &c. Yea, and the commands to love God and your neighbor are also abolished with all the moral precepts of the Old Testament!

This conclusion cannot be evaded, for the apostles distinctly say that excepting the four items mentioned, no part of the law under consideration is to be observed by Christians. If, therefore, there was only one law in the Old Testament, if the law covers all the precepts of the Old Testament, then the great commandment to love God with all your heart, Deut. 6:5, and the second, to love your neighbor as yourself, Lev. 19-18, are abolished! What a blasphemous conclusion! What do our opponents do with this dilemma? What do they say about it? Just nothing at all. They are speechless. And yet they will doggedly cling to their position and bring it up again and again with all these absurdities staring them in the face.

But all is plain and consistent when we understand that the reference is, not to the moral law and its precepts and explanations throughout all the Old Testament, but to the ceremonial and civil law given through Moses and peculiar only to the Jews. This is further evident from the fact that the decree of the apostles related only to the Gentiles. Says James, "My sentence is, that we trouble not them which from among the Gen-

tiles are turned to God." Verse 19. This law has no bearing upon them, hence they need not keep it. But none can deny that the Gentiles were under as much obligation to keep the moral law as were the Jews, which shows that the decalogue was not the law under consideration.

ROMANS 6:14.

We are not under the law, but under grace
Rom. 6:14.

Probably this passage is urged as an objection to the perpetuity of the law oftener than any other. That the law here is the decalogue, we all agree. What, then, is meant by the term, "*under the law*"? We understand it to mean, to be condemned by the law. Our opponents claim that it means to be under obligation to obey the law; and as Paul says we are not under the law, they claim that we are not now obliged to keep the law. Can it be that we need not keep the commandments against adultery, murder, theft, idolatry, &c.? If their position is correct, this must follow, for these are a part of the law. Paul's entire argument in this book shows that this is not his meaning.

What subject has he under consideration in this chapter? It is not the difference between the old law and the new, the change from the old dispensation to the new; but the change which takes place in individuals at their conversion, a change from the old man to the new man, from sin to holiness, from condemnation to grace. He first asks, "How shall we, that are dead to sin, live any longer therein?" Verse 2. Then he says, "We are buried with him [Christ] by baptism." Verse 4. This shows that he is

speaking only of converted men. Next, he says, "Knowing this, that our old man is crucified with him, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that *henceforth* we should not serve sin." Verse 6. That this refers to conversion, and not to a change from the old covenant to the new, will be seen by every candid mind. Further on he says, "Likewise reckon ye also yourselves to be dead indeed unto sin, but alive unto God through Jesus Christ our Lord." Verse 11: Of whom is this true? Only of the converted man. So he is not speaking of all men in general, but only of saints. Again: "Let not sin, therefore, reign in your mortal body, that ye should obey it in the lusts thereof." Verse 12. What is *sin*? John says, "Sin is the transgression of the law." 1 John 3:4. Paul then exhorts them not to let their fleshly members and passions lead them to transgress the law. "For," said he, "sin shall not have dominion over you." Verse 14. Why not? Because the law is abolished? No; but because they have left the service of sin, have ceased to transgress the law of God. His whole argument shows that this is what he means. "For sin shall not have dominion over you; for ye are not under the law, but under grace." Verse 14. That is, having broken off your sins, ceased to break the law, believed in Christ, and been baptized, you are now no longer ruled over by sin, nor condemned by the law, because you have found grace in the sight of God and your sins are pardoned. Then he asks in the next verse, "What then? shall we sin [that is, transgress the law, for, remember, 'sin is the transgression of the law'] because we are not under the law, but under grace? God forbid."

This conclusion of Paul's utterly demolishes the theory of our opponents. For if "not under the law" means that we are not to obey the law, then it follows that we could transgress it at will. But this, Paul vetoes with a "God forbid."

Take two more places where Paul uses the term "under the law" as meaning, to be condemned by the law. Thus he says, in Gal. 5: 16-18, "This I say then, Walk in the Spirit, and ye shall not fulfill the lust of the flesh. For the flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh; and these are contrary the one to the other; so that ye cannot do the things that ye would. But if ye be led of the Spirit, ye are not under the law." Now, in this case, who are not under the law? Those who are led of the Spirit, and those only. And who are those who are led of the Spirit? Those who do not fulfill the lusts of the flesh—that is, do not commit sin. No other meaning can be given to this text. Then those who are not under the law are converted men whose sins are pardoned, who have received the Spirit of God, and hence do not transgress his law any more. It has not the slightest reference to the abolition of the law. Paul says that those who *are led* of the Spirit are *not* under the law. Then it follows that those who are *not led* by the Spirit *are* under the law. This conclusion is so plain that no candid man will deny it. Well, are the wicked led by the Spirit? No. Then they are under the law. But if the law has been abolished, then no one can now be under it, no more the wicked than the righteous. This shows that the law does still exist and has power to condemn the transgressor. Now look a moment at the absurd-

ity of our opponents' position. They say that by the term "not under the law," Paul means that the law is abolished, and hence we need not obey it. If this be true, then no one is under the law, whether he is led by the Spirit or not. But Paul declares that in order not to be under the law, we must be led by the Spirit. How plainly this contradicts their conclusion.

Take one more case. In Rom. 3:9-19, Paul says, "We have before proved both Jews and Gentiles, that they are all under sin; as it is written, There is none righteous, no, not one." And so he goes on in several verses to prove that all are sinners. Then he concludes thus: "Now we know that what things soever the law saith, it saith to them who are under the law, that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world may become guilty before God." Verse 19. Now, what is the consequence of being under the law? Paul says it is "that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world may become guilty before God." So that to be under the law is to have our mouths stopped, and to stand guilty and condemned before God.

No better proof could be given that the meaning which Paul designs to convey is, that the phrase, "not under the law but under grace," means simply not under the condemnation of the law, because not sinners, but in the freedom of the gospel, through the forgiveness of our sins.

ROMANS 7.

The position of our opponents on this chapter is, that Paul is showing the contrast between the old dispensation and the new—between the law

and the gospel. We believe that Paul has no reference whatever to any such thing, but continues the same subject that he considered in the sixth chapter, namely, the change which takes place in every individual at his conversion from sin to holiness. He first shows how the law condemns the sinner and yet is just and holy in doing it; and then, how the sinner obtains pardon and grace through faith in Christ and thereby receives strength to keep the law which he previously found himself unable to obey. Thus we read: "Know ye not, brethren (for I speak to them that know the law), how that the law hath dominion over a man as long as he liveth?" Verse 1. He then illustrates what he means by this statement. "For the woman which hath an husband is bound by the law to her husband so long as he liveth; but if the husband be dead, she is loosed from the law of her husband." Verse 2.

Consider the illustration. To-day a woman in Iowa marries Mr. Smith. Now the law of Iowa binds her to Mr. Smith as long as he lives. There are three things in the illustration. 1. The woman. 2. The husband. 3. The law. Paul says, "If the husband be dead, she is loosed from the law of her husband." Mark, she is loosed from that law. But what is it that died in this illustration? Is it the law? Suppose that Mr. Smith dies just as Paul says, does that abolish the law of Iowa which bound her to Mr. Smith? How absurd that would be! No; the law does not die, and yet the death of Mr. Smith does loose the woman from that law; not because the law is dead, but because the person is dead to whom it bound the woman. Paul

proceeds: "So then if, while her husband liveth, she be married to another man, she shall be called an adulteress." Certainly, if while Mr. Smith lives she should marry Mr. Jones, she would be an adulteress; for the law does not allow her to have two husbands at the same time. Paul goes on: "But if her husband be dead, she is freed from that law, so that she is no adulteress though she be married to another man." Yes, if Mr. Smith dies, then she is freed from the law of Iowa, and can now marry Mr. Jones lawfully. Bear it in mind that Paul twice says that if her husband dies she is loosed from the law, freed from the law. But the same law which bound her to Mr. Smith now binds her to Mr. Jones. It will be seen that in all this illustration there is not the slightest reference to the death or abolition of the law; the law remains the same all the time. It is the husband that dies, not the law. Now, did Paul know how to properly use an illustration, or not? We think he did, quite as well as our opponents.

If this illustration is a proper one, it is a very unfortunate one for the no-law position: for in his illustration, the law never died at all, while he declares that by the death of the husband the woman is freed, loosed from the law, and yet the law lives. Now the only question is, What is represented in the illustration by the two husbands? The answer is, Not the old law and the new law, but the old man and the new man. The old man, the carnal mind, the body of sin, the unconverted man, is represented by the first husband, and the Lord Jesus Christ by the second husband. The following language of Paul settles this point: "Wherefore, my brethren, ye

also are become dead to the law by the body of Christ; that ye should be married to another, even to him who is raised from the dead, that we should bring forth fruit unto God." Verse 4.

Paul plainly says, "My brethren, *ye* are become dead"—not that the law is dead; but it was these brethren who died. Then with whom is the second marriage made? This he as plainly states: They should be married to him who is raised from the dead. In other words, while the old, carnal man lived, the law of God bound them down in condemnation to that old body of sin; but when that was dead, then they were united to Christ. The next verse confirms the fact that Paul is speaking here of their conversion from sin to righteousness. "For when we were in the flesh, the motions of sins, which were by the law, did work in our members to bring forth fruit unto death." Verse 5. "When we were in the flesh," plainly means when we were unconverted; and has no reference to being under some former dispensation. He continues: "But now we are delivered from the law, that being dead wherein we were held." Verse 6. The margin says, "Being dead to that" wherein we were held. The American Bible Union translation says, "Having died to that wherein we were held"; that is, the old man having died which kept us from being united to Christ, we are delivered from the law, just as in our illustration the woman was delivered from the law of Iowa when Mr. Smith died. That it was not the law, but the old man, that died, is put beyond controversy by the following language: "For I was alive without the law once; but when the commandment came, sin revived, and I died. And the

commandment which was ordained to life, I found to be unto death. For sin, taking occasion by the commandment, deceived me, and by it slew me." Verses 9-11. Here Paul says, "I died;" the law "slew me." Now did the law die? or did Paul die? He says emphatically the law slew him. Then it was not the law that died, but the old man.

Then hear his conclusion. If the position of our opponents be true, Paul should have concluded like this: Wherefore the law is dead and abolished, it being a yoke of bondage. But instead of such a conclusion he sums it up thus: "Wherefore the law is holy, and the commandment holy, and just, and good." Verse 12. This conclusion, as all can see, is in perfect harmony with the position we have taken, but utterly irreconcilable with the position of our opponents.

In the same strain, verse 14, he says, "For we know that the law is spiritual; but I am carnal, sold under sin." So also, verse 22, "For I delight in the law of God after the inward man." Did he delight in an old dead law, which never was better than a yoke of bondage? Strange that men can pervert the word of God to such unreasonable conclusions.

In the following verses Paul proceeds to show that, while he consents with his mind to the law that it is good and just, and ought to be obeyed, and even resolves to obey it, yet notwithstanding this, the sinful propensities are so strong that they overcome the good intentions and resolutions; and instead of being able to keep the law of God he finds himself continually transgressing it. Thus he says: "For that which I do I allow not; for what I would, that do I not; but what

I hate, that do I. If then I do that which I would not, I consent unto the law that it is good. Now then it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me. For I know that in me (that is, in my flesh), dwelleth no good thing; for to will is present with me; but how to perform that which is good I find not. For the good that I would, I do not; but the evil which I would not, that I do. Now if I do that I would not, it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me. I find then a law, that, when I would do good, evil is present with me. For I delight in the law of God after the inward man." Verses 15-22.

Paul says that he delights in the law of God after the inward man, that is, in his mind he admires the law of God; its justice, holiness, and purity, and feels that it ought to be obeyed; but at the same time he finds all the inclinations of the natural man directly opposed to this law and constantly leading him to transgress it.

Thus he contrasts these two laws; for it will be noticed that he speaks of two laws, namely, the law of God, and the law of sin which is in his members. Thus he says: "For I delight in the law of God after the inward man. But I see *another law in my members*, warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin which is in my members. O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death? I thank God, through Jesus Christ our Lord. So then with the mind I myself serve the law of God; but with the flesh the law of sin." Verses 22-25.

That the law of sin is here set in contrast with the law of God, none can fail to see. It will be necessary to bear this distinction in mind in

order to understand what follows: "There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit. For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death." Chap. 8:1, 2.

Who are here spoken of? Those who no longer walk after the flesh; hence are converted men. Therefore this is true of them only. From what has Christ freed these men? From the law of sin and death. Is that the law of God, the decalogue? No; for we have before shown that this law of sin and death is the one which rules in the carnal man, and is directly opposed to the law of God. Christ Jesus has freed them from this law, not only by forgiving them their sins, but by giving them grace and spiritual strength to conquer their fleshly passions, and thus enabling them to obey the law of God, which before they could not do.

In the next two verses Paul reaches the grand conclusion to which he has been leading us in all this argument, viz., that the very object of the grace which we receive through Christ is to enable us to fulfill the law, which without this grace we never could do. Thus he says: "For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh; that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit." Verses 3, 4. Then there is something which the law could not do, which nevertheless the grace of God can enable man to perform, that is, to properly keep the law of God. The law demands a strictly righteous

and sinless life in every man. It says, Thou shalt do this, and, Thou shalt not do that. But simply requiring this does not enable the sinner to perform it; nor is the law able in any manner to give him strength to do it. The law can demand this and that, and punish the transgressor for not doing it, but it cannot give grace and strength by which to do these things. Here the grace of Christ comes in and so strengthens us that, says Paul, the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us who walk not after the flesh but after the Spirit. Mark you, Paul does not say that the grace of Christ comes in to supersede and set aside the law, as our opponents claim. No, no; but just the reverse of this, that is, that the righteousness of the law, or as the Bible Union has it, the requirements of the law, might be fulfilled in us.

Finally, he says: "Because the carnal mind is enmity against God; for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be." Verse 7. Here the grand difficulty with regard to the law of God is fairly stated. What is it? Is it that the law is dead? that it is a yoke of bondage? that it is abolished? that it is no longer to be obeyed? Oh, no! but it is the carnal mind which is in the way, and which will not submit itself to this holy law of God. It must be slain and subdued before obedience can be yielded to the law. We fear that the same difficulty exists to-day with those who find so much trouble with the law of God. If they would try as hard to conquer and put down the carnal mind as they do to put down the law, they would soon delight in the law of God as did Paul.

ROMANS 10:4.

Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth. Rom. 10:4.

We agree that this means the decalogue, but we do not agree that it means that Christ has put an end to that law. End does not always mean termination. It is very frequently used as meaning the object of a thing, as James 5:11: "Ye have heard of the patience of Job, and have seen the end of the Lord." This certainly does not mean that the Lord died in the days of Job. James means to say, Ye have seen the object of the Lord in the afflictions he brought on Job. The word end is used in that sense in the text. Christ is the object of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth. That is, those who believe in Christ receive grace from him which enables them to carry out and accomplish the object of the law, that is, to obey the law and be righteous men.

1 Tim. 1:5, is another illustration of the use of the word end. "Now the end of the commandment is charity out of a pure heart, and of a good conscience, and of faith unfeigned." Would any one claim that by the term, end of the commandment, Paul meant that the commandment had died? Every one knows better. That is not Paul's meaning. The simple meaning is this: The object of the commandment is charity out of a pure heart.

Precisely the same is the meaning of the text in Rom. 10:4. But take our opponents' view of it a moment. They say that this text means that Christ put an end to the law. Very well; to

whom did he end it? Paul says, "To every one that believeth." Then it is ended only to the believer; but to the unbeliever it is not ended, and hence is still binding on him. According to this, a man should keep the law of God till he is converted, and then should not obey it any longer! What an absurd conclusion! We think this objection is not worthy of a more extended notice.

2 CORINTHIANS 3.

The ministration of death, written and engraven on stones, was done away. 2 Cor. 3.

We think an examination of the context will show that this text furnishes no proof of the abolition of the ten commandments. Paul says, verse 3, "Forasmuch as ye are manifestly declared to be the epistle of Christ ministered by us, written, not with ink, but with the Spirit of the living God; not in tables of stone, but in fleshy tables of the heart." That this refers to the decalogue, written on tables of stone in the old dispensation, is evident. And more, it is just as manifest a reference to the promise which God made in Jer. 31:33, that in the new covenant he would write that same law in the hearts of believers. Thus that promise reads: "After those days, saith the Lord, I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts." God's law, which once was written on tables of stone, is now written on the tables of the heart by the Spirit of God.

Next the apostle states that the exalted privilege of aiding in this work is now committed to the gospel minister. "And such trust have we through Christ to Godward; not that we are sufficient of ourselves to think anything as of our-

selves; but our sufficiency is of God, who also hath made us able ministers of the new testament; not of the letter, but of the spirit; for the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life." Verses 4-6.

The letter that killeth does not mean the law, as some assert. It is the letter of the new testament, for so Paul plainly says: "Ministers of the new testament; not of the letter, but of the spirit." Letter of what? Of the new testament. Language could hardly be plainer. But is there a letter and a spirit to the new testament? Certainly, as well as there was to the old. To be baptized, to take the Lord's supper, to join the church, to say prayers, &c., is the letter or outward form of the gospel. But a person could strictly perform all these, and yet be lost. To obtain life through the gospel we must obey it, not only in letter, but in spirit too. This is just the point which Paul here plainly states.

This is the same as he said to these very Corinthians in another place: "For Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the gospel." 1 Cor. 1:17. That is, not *simply* to baptize and attend to these outward forms, the letter, but to teach the spirit of the gospel also; for he did baptize always.

God had made him a minister, not simply of the outward and dead form, but of the spirit and power of the gospel. It is a groundless assertion to say that the "letter" means the old law, and the "spirit" means the gospel.

Thus Dr. Clarke says: "The apostle does not mean here, as some have imagined, that he states himself to be a minister of the New Testament in opposition to the Old; and that it is the Old

Testament that kills, and the New that gives life. . . . The gospel has both its letter and its spirit; and multitudes of professing Christians, by resting in the letter, receive not the life which it is calculated to impart."—*Com. on 2 Cor. 3:6.*

Next Paul proceeds to compare this work of the gospel ministry with the work of the old Levitical ministry. "But if the ministration of death, written and engraven in stones, was glorious, so that the children of Israel could not steadfastly behold the face of Moses for the glory of his countenance; which glory was to be done away; how shall not the ministration of the Spirit be rather glorious? For if the ministration of condemnation be glory, much more doth the ministration of righteousness exceed in glory." Verses 7-9.

Now the answer to one simple question must determine the controversy between us on this passage. Is Paul comparing two *laws*? or two *ministrations*? the old law with the new law? or the old ministry with the new ministry? Our opponents claim that Paul is *contrasting* the old abolished law of ten commandments with the new law of the gospel. But there is no such idea nor words in the passage. "The ministration of death," and "the ministration of condemnation," he compares with "the ministration of the Spirit" and "the ministration of righteousness," declaring that one was glorious and the other more glorious. Is "*ministration*" a law? No; it is the service, or work, of a minister. Thus Webster defines it: "1. The act of performing service as a subordinate agent; agency; intervention for aid or service. 2. Office of a minister; service; ecclesiastical function." He quotes Luke 1:23,

as an illustration; "As soon as the days of his ministration were accomplished." It is plain, then, that it is the work, or service, of the ministers, which Paul is comparing; the Levitical ministry with the gospel ministry. The first was glorious, the second excelleth in glory.

With this view, we can understand why he refers to the glory that rested upon the face of Moses. Moses was prime minister of that dispensation, stood at the head of all those ministers, hence represented them in their work. Therefore, when God honored him by putting his visible glory upon him, it was not as an individual, merely, but as the representative of that dispensation. If it were the law, of which Paul was speaking, he should have referred, not to the glory that rested on Moses, a minister, but to the glory that rested on the law, or the ark containing it, or that which was manifest on Sinai in giving the ten commandments. In verse 13, Paul says: "And not as Moses, which put a vail over his face, that the children of Israel could not steadfastly look to the end of that which is abolished." What was abolished? That which was covered by the vail over Moses' face. This is too plain to be denied. Very well; were the tables of stone covered by this vail? If not, then they are not that which was abolished. Turning to the record, Ex. 34:29-35, we read: "When Moses came down from Mount Sinai with the two tables of testimony in Moses' hand, when he came down from the mount, that Moses wist not that the skin of his face shone while he talked with him. . . . And till Moses had done speaking with them, he put a vail on his face," &c.

Thus we see that it was simply the glory which

shone from Moses' face which was covered by the vail, while the tables of stone were in Moses' hands and were in no way covered by it. Paul says that the vail covered that which was abolished, so that the Israelites could not see it. But the law was not thus covered from their sight by the vail. They could and did see that. If a person were not willingly blind, it would seem that he might see a point so plain as this.

I have seen it asserted that in this chapter Paul says of the law that it "was to be done away," verse 7, "which is done away," verse 11, "which is abolished," verse 13, and "is done away in Christ," verse 14. Certainly it would be a very strong case if all these phrases were applied to the law. But look at them. The first one, verse 7, instead of applying to the law, is applied directly to the glory that shone from Moses' face—"which glory was to be done away." These are Paul's words. The third one, verse 13, says that what was abolished was covered from sight by the vail over Moses' face. Here, again, it could not be the law, as we have shown above. The fourth one, verse 14, says, "Which vail is done away in Christ." Here again it is applied to a very different thing from the law. The second one, verse 11, is the only one where it is not directly applied in the verse itself to something besides the law; and here the connection shows that it is the "ministration" which is done away, not the decalogue.

But does not Paul, in verse 7, say that this ministration, which is done away, was written and engraven in stones? We think not. Indeed, it would be nonsense to talk of writing a *ministration* in stones or in anything else. You

cannot *write* a ministration. A ministration must be *performed*, not written. Why so? Because it is an *act*, a *work*, and not an instrument. Paul's words are these: "But if the ministration of death, written and engraven in stones, was glorious," &c. "For if the ministration of condemnation be glory," &c. I understand Paul's meaning to be this: The ten commandments were written and engraven in stones. The penalty for the violation of these was *death*. They caused death to be inflicted on those who transgressed them. Hence, as is frequent in the use of language, putting the *cause* for the *effect*, the decalogue is here called *death*. 2 Kings 4:40, is a good illustration of this use of the word death. By a mistake, poisonous gourds were boiled in a pot, to eat. When they discovered this, one cried out, "O thou man of God, there is death in the pot." That is, there is that in the pot which, if eaten, will cause death. Hence, putting the cause for the effect, they said, Death is in the pot, *i. e.*, that which will cause death. So the apostle here. That written in stones, the decalogue, is called death, as it causes death to the transgressor.

Hence, it was "*death*" which was written in stones, and not the ministration of death. Suppose a case under the old dispensation. A man steals. The law condemns him to death. Now this death must be executed upon him, or administered to him by some one. This was done, as we well know, by the proper ministers of the law. Cannot all see that death is one thing, and the ministration of that death quite another thing? The ministration was the work, the act, the service, which the minister performed in ex-

ecuting the condemnation of the law. Hence, it is called "the ministration of condemnation." So we repeat, it was not the *ministration* which was written in stones; but death was written there, and there were ministers of the law whose business it was to see this death properly ministered to the transgressor. Now the office, the work, the service, of these ministers, is what the apostle is comparing with the office, the work, the service, of the gospel minister.

But what is the point which Paul has in view in making this argument in this chapter? A proper understanding of this will help us to correctly understand his argument. Is he laboring to show the greater excellence and glory of a new law as compared with the old one? Nothing of the kind appears in all his argument; but the one prominent point he all along keeps before his reader is, the greater glory and excellence of the ministry committed to him as compared with that committed to Moses. Under that ministration, they condemned men and put them to death; under this, they proclaim pardon, life, righteousness, and the gift of the Spirit. If the former was glorious, how much more the latter? Thus he says: "For if the ministration of condemnation be glory, much more doth the ministration of righteousness exceed in glory." Verse 9.

The Greek word *diakonia*, translated "ministration," occurs thirty-three times in the New Testament, but is never rendered law. This shows that ministration does not mean the law. Another conclusive proof that it is not the law which is done away, is the fact that the word in the passage rendered "abolish" and "done away," is

katargeo, the same word that is rendered "make void" in Rom. 3:31, where Paul says, "Do we then make void [*katargeo*, abolish] the law through faith? God forbid; yea, we establish the law." Here the apostle positively asserts that the law is not abolished. Would he then turn square about and affirm that it is abolished? No. That which Paul, in 2 Cor. 3, says is abolished is the old ministration.*

GALATIANS EXAMINED.

What object did Paul have in view in his letter to the Galatians? Does he find fault with them for keeping any one of the ten commandments? No such thing is mentioned in the whole letter. In the first chapter he appeals to them thus: "For ye have heard of my conversation in time past in the Jews' religion, how that beyond measure I persecuted the church of God, and wasted it; and profited in the Jews' religion above many my equals in mine own nation, being more exceedingly zealous of the *traditions* of my fathers." Verses 13, 14. Here he men-

*NOTE. The construction of the Greek, which shows a grammatical agreement between the noun ministration and the participle "engraven" on stones, is no objection to the view here taken. Bloomfield, notes *in loco*, shows that the sentence is elliptical, and that the ministration simply refers to that which was engraven on stone. Alford's Testament on this passage says: "It seems strange that the *ministration* should be described as engraven on stones; but the *ministration* is the whole putting forth of the dispensation, the purport of which was summed up in the decalogue written on stones." Olshausen, in his Commentary, says on this passage: "The *ἐντετυπωμένη ἐν λίθοις* [engraven in stones] refers only figuratively to *diakonia* [ministration]: its primary reference is to the decalogue inscribed upon the table of the law."

tions the traditions of the fathers, for which he had been very zealous. He further says that the gospel which he preached was directly revealed to him by Christ himself, and was not taught him by any man. See verses 15-24.

Next, Paul refers these Gentile Galatians back to that great council at Jerusalem, which he and Barnabas attended, as recorded in Acts 15; where the question about circumcision and that whole law was fully discussed and settled. Compare Acts 15:1-5 with Gal 2:1-3, and it will be seen that both refer to the same time and the same question. Hence the decision of that council had a direct bearing upon the question that was troubling the Galatians. So he refers to that council and to the action there taken to convince these Gentile Galatians that they were regarding a law that was no longer to be kept by the disciples. Thus he says: "Then fourteen years after I went up again to Jerusalem with Barnabas, and took Titus with me also. But neither Titus who was with me, being a Greek, was compelled to be circumcised." Gal. 2:1, 3. Though Titus was a minister, still it was decided that he, being a Gentile, need not be circumcised. This fact, of course, would have great weight with the Gentile Galatians in deciding their duty touching the same question.

This fact shows to which law this letter relates. There is no question raised with regard to any precept of the moral law; but every reference is to the ceremonial law. See chapter 2:11-14: "But when Peter was come to Antioch, I withstood him to the face, because he was to be blamed. For before that certain came from James, he did eat with the Gentiles; but when

they were come, he withdrew and separated himself, fearing them which were of the circumcision. And the other Jews dissembled likewise with him; insomuch that Barnabas also was carried away with their dissimulation. But when I saw that they walked not uprightly, according to the truth of the gospel, I said unto Peter before them all, If thou, being a Jew, livest after the manner of Gentiles, and not as do the Jews, why compellest thou the Gentiles to live as do the Jews?" How does this affect the question which Paul is arguing with the Galatians, if the moral law is the one under consideration? It could have no bearing upon it whatever. But if it be the ceremonial law, it is indeed very much to the point.

Peter, a Jew and an apostle, goes to Antioch and freely eats with the Gentiles, which is a direct violation of the ceremonial law. But when certain zealous Jews came from Jerusalem, Peter withdrew from the Gentiles, and would eat with them no more, thus appearing to show that he regarded the ceremonial law as still in force and binding on Christians. Paul justly reproved him for this. "If thou, being a Jew, livest after the manner of the Gentiles, and not as do the Jews, why compellest thou the Gentiles to live as do the Jews?" In other words, if Peter, a Jew, could disregard that law, how much more the Gentiles. What law had he violated? Any one of the ten commandments? No, he had simply eaten with the Gentiles, and thus broken the ceremonial law of the Jews. This fact is decisive in showing what law is under consideration here.

Further on Paul asks them, "Are ye so foolish? having begun in the Spirit, are ye now

made perfect by the flesh? Chap. 3:3. This has plain reference to the fleshly or carnal ordinances of the ceremonial law, of which Paul in another place says: "Which stood only in meats and drinks, and divers washings, and carnal ordinances, imposed on them until the time of reformation." Heb. 9:10. It could not refer to the decalogue, because those precepts are spiritual and directly opposed to the flesh. Rom. 7:14; 8:7. Again Paul says: "As many as desire to make a fair show in the flesh, they constrain you to be circumcised; only lest they should suffer persecution for the cross of Christ." Gal. 6:12.

Here these works of the flesh are directly connected with circumcision; and those who kept that law did it to avoid the cross of Christ, because by regarding the ceremonies of the Jews, they would please them and so escape persecution. That the law here spoken of is that which was written by Moses in the book and not the one on the tables of stone, is shown by the following: "For as many as are of the works of the law are under the curse; for it is written, Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them." Chap. 3:10. But verse 19 is decisive: "Wherefore then serveth the law? It was added because of transgressions, till the seed should come to whom the promise was made; and it was ordained by angels in the hand of a mediator." To the question, What is the object of this law? Paul answers that it was added because of transgression. Transgression is the violation of the law. 1 John 3:4. Again, where no law is, there is no transgression. Rom. 4:15.

Then it follows that some law existed and was

transgressed before this law was given. Nor would it have been given if the other law had not been previously transgressed. We have already seen how this was. When man violated the moral law he became a sinner, needing a Saviour to redeem him. To point to this coming Saviour it became necessary to offer sacrifices. Then there must be priests to offer these, an altar and a temple. All these things required a law to regulate them. Hence it became necessary, as we have seen, to institute the ceremonial law. How long were these sacrifices, the temple, altar, priests, &c., to continue? Till Christ should come, to whom they pointed. Hence that law ended there of necessity. So Paul says it was added till the seed should come. But why should the moral law terminate there? Paul further says, It was ordained by angels in the hand of a mediator—precisely the way in which the law of Moses was given. But the decalogue was given by God himself, written by his own finger, not in a book, but on tables of stone. Then what follows puts it beyond question that it is only the typical law of which Paul was writing. "Wherefore the law was our school-master to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith. But after that faith is come we are no longer under a school-master." Verses 24, 25.

The law here spoken of is one that pointed to Christ, the sole object for which the law of types and shadows was given. Col. 2:17; Heb. 10:1. Christ was the grand center to which that whole law pointed. But what does the moral law say about Christ? Nothing at all. It points out man's duty, but does not point to Christ. Chap. 5:1-3, furnishes further proof that it is not the

ten commandments that are under consideration. "Stand fast, therefore, in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage. Behold, I Paul say unto you, that if ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing. For I testify again to every man that is circumcised, that he is a debtor to do the whole law."

It will be seen that there is no reference here to the decalogue, but to the law of circumcision. If you be circumcised, says Paul, Christ shall profit you nothing. This he keeps constantly before their minds. He says, Whoever is circumcised is bound to keep the whole law, that is, the whole of that law of which circumcision is a part; because if one part is binding, it all is. Hence they must offer sacrifices, &c. He calls it a yoke of bondage, the same term which Peter applies to the law of Moses. Acts 15:10. Can this apply to the ten commandments? Is it a yoke of bondage to obey them?

Who will stand up and say that these are a yoke of bondage to him? The man who does will declare himself to be a wicked, carnal man.

The above facts clearly show that it is only the ceremonial law of which Paul is treating in Galatians. It furnishes strong proof of our position that all Bible writers recognized the distinction between the moral and ceremonial laws.

EPHESIANS 2:14, 15.

This is a passage which is appealed to as proof that the decalogue has been abolished; but it can be readily shown that it proves just the reverse. Let us read it:—

"For he is our peace, who hath made both one,

and hath broken down the middle wall of partition between us; having abolished in his flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances; for to make in himself of twain one new man, so making peace."

Notice a few facts: There was a certain law here, called "a middle wall of partition," which kept the Jews and Gentiles separate. This wall was broken down by Christ. Was this the moral law, or the law of ordinances? Every candid person must admit that it was the latter. The law of circumcision, the one regulating clean and unclean things, and their innumerable washings, carnal ordinances and ceremonies, was instituted for the purpose of keeping the Jews a distinct and separate people till the Messiah should come. This was the great object of that law. Hence it was peculiar to the Jews. It never applied to the Gentiles. But the precepts of the moral law were just as applicable to the Gentiles as to the Jews. Was not the law against idolatry, profanity, murder, theft, &c., as applicable to the Gentiles as to the Jews? Of course. Here they are on common ground. This erected no wall between them, but the law of ordinances did.

To this, Paul refers. He says, "Having abolished in his flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments." If Paul had stopped here, as he certainly ought to have done if there had been only one law, and it had all been abolished as our opponents teach, then there would be some show for that position; but he puts on a qualifying phrase which shows beyond question that he knew there were two laws of a very different kind, one which had been abolished and one which had not. Notice how carefully he states

this, "Having abolished in his flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments *contained in ordinances.*" What law is abolished? Answer, That one contained in ordinances. Was there a law relating simply to ordinances and to nothing else? Certainly, for so Paul declares in Heb. 9: 10: "Which stood only in meats and drinks, and divers washings, and carnal ordinances, imposed on them until the time of reformation." That this relates to the ceremonial law of the Jews no one can fail to see.

The very fact that Paul, when he states that the law was abolished, carefully qualifies this statement by saying that it is the law contained in ordinances, shows that he knew that there was another law not contained in ordinances, which was not abolished. To illustrate: A physician says to his servant, Go to my office and bring me an ounce of medicine contained in the black bottle. This is virtually saying that there is other medicine contained in other bottles. If there was only one kind of medicine he would simply say, Go to my office and bring me an ounce of medicine.

So in this case, when Paul says the law is abolished, he specifies which one, namely, the one contained in ordinances, thus virtually saying that that which was not contained in ordinances was not abolished. The ceremonial law related wholly to ordinances. If the apostles taught the abolition of the moral law is it not remarkable that they make no reference to any of these commandments when speaking of the abolition of the law? On the other hand, every reference they make is always to the law of ordinances.

Contrast this passage a moment with the language of the same apostle in Rom. 3:31: "Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid; yea, we establish the law." The words "make void," in this text are from the Greek word *katargeo*, which is the very word rendered "abolished" in Eph. 2:15. Hence in Rom. 3:31, Paul emphatically declares that the law is not abolished. But in Eph. 2:15, he positively says it is abolished. How can these two statements be reconciled? It is utterly impossible for Paul in both places to be speaking of the same law. But if we understand him to speak in one place of the moral law, and in the other of the ceremonial law, his meaning is plain, and there is no contradiction. The mistake that our opponents make is in applying to the moral law what the apostle says of the ceremonial law.

COLOSSIANS 2:14-17.

Col. 2:14-17 is another passage furnishing strong proof on the two-law position. It reads thus: "Blotting out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross; and having spoiled principalities and powers, he made a show of them openly, triumphing over them in it. Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holy day, or of the new moon, or of the sabbath days, which are a shadow of things to come, but the body is of Christ."

I believe it can be clearly shown that there is not one reference in all this to the moral law or seventh-day Sabbath. On this, Dr. Adam Clarke says: "By the handwriting of ordinances, the

apostle most evidently means the *ceremonial law*." Comment on verse 14. Look at the figures used. "*Blotting out*." That which was written on parchment in books, as was the ceremonial law, could be blotted out with a wet sponge. See Num. 5:23. But it would be improper and absurd to talk of blotting out what was engraved in stones, as was the decalogue. "*Handwriting*." The ceremonial law was the handwriting of Moses, but the decalogue was written by the finger of God. Ex. 31:18. "*Of ordinances*." Here is further proof that it is the law of ceremonial ordinances which is meant. Compare with Heb. 9:10: "Which stood only in meats and drinks, and divers washings, and carnal ordinances, imposed on them until the time of reformation." Then there was a law which stood only in these carnal *ordinances* of meats, drinks, &c., the very things of which the apostle speaks in Colossians. Mark that these were *imposed* on them as a burden. So in Eph. 2:15: "Having abolished in his flesh the *enmity*, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances."

Here, too, we have the law of *ordinances*,¹ the *enmity*, abolished. "That was *against* us, which was *contrary* to us." The ceremonial law with all its rites and ordinances, which must be carefully regarded in the smallest affairs of every-day life, was indeed a burden, a yoke, and against them, imposed upon them to keep them a separate people till Christ came. But which of the ten commandments is against us? Look them over. Is it against us, 1. To have no other gods? 2. Not to make or worship an image? 3. Not to swear 5. To honor our parents?

6. Not to kill? 7. Nor commit adultery? 8. Nor steal? 9. Nor lie? 10. Nor covet? Are not these commandments good, and for our best interest? But perhaps the fourth precept, the Sabbath, is against us? No, indeed; for Christ himself said, "The Sabbath was made *for* man." Mark 2:27. That which is for man cannot be against him.

"*Nailing it to his cross*." It would be proper to speak of nailing to the cross a parchment, or laws written on paper, but entirely improper if the reference is to the tables of stone. They could not be nailed up. Notice now the items which the apostle mentions, not one of which is in the decalogue, but all of which are in the ceremonial laws. "Let no man therefore judge you *in meat*." Anything in the ten commandments about meat? Not a word. "*Or in drink*." Anything there about drink? Nothing. "*Or in respect of an holy day*." The original word here rendered holy day, is *heortee*, which means a feast day. Thus Greenfield defines it: "A solemn feast, public festival, holy day." It occurs twenty-seven times in the New Testament, and is, except in this place, every time rendered "feast," or "feast day."

The complete use of *heortee* in the New Testament as given in the Englishman's Greek Concordance is as follows:—

- | | |
|---------------|---|
| Matt. 26 : 5. | they said, Not on the <i>feast</i> (day). |
| " 27 : 15. | at (that) <i>feast</i> the governor was |
| Mark 14 : 2. | they said, Not on the <i>feast</i> (day), |
| " 15 : 6. | Now at (that) <i>feast</i> he released unto |
| Luke 2 : 41. | at the <i>feast</i> of the passover. |
| " 2 : 42. | after the custom of the <i>feast</i> . |
| " 22 : 1. | the <i>feast</i> of unleavened bread. |
| " 23 : 17. | release one unto them at the <i>feast</i> . |

- John 2 : 23. At the passover, in the *feast* (day).
 " 4 : 45. at Jerusalem at the *feast* : for they also
 went unto the *feast*.
 " 5 : 1. there was a *feast* of the Jews ;
 " 6 : 4. a *feast* of the Jews was nigh.
 " 7 : 2. the Jew's *feast* of tabernacles was
 " 7 : 8. Go ye up unto this *feast* : I go not up
 yet unto this *feast*.
 " 7 : 10. went he also up unto the *feast*.
 " 7 : 11. Jews sought him at the *feast*.
 " 7 : 14. About the midst of the *feast*.
 " 7 : 37. that great (day) of the *feast*.
 " 11 : 56. he will not come to the *feast* ?
 " 12 : 12. were come to the *feast*.
 " 12 : 20. to worship at the *feast* :
 " 13 : 1. before the *feast* of the passover.
 " 13 : 29. need of against the *feast* ;
 Acts 18 : 21. by all means keep this *feast*.
 Col. 2 : 16. or in respect of an *holy day*.

By this it will readily be seen that *heortee* always means a feast day, and should have been so rendered here.

The Diaglott renders it thus: "Let no one, therefore, rule you in food, or in drink, or in respect of a festival." There were many festival (*heortee*) days in the ceremonial law, but not one in the decalogue. See the yearly festivals enumerated in Lev. 23:2, 4, 6, 34, 37, 39, 41, &c., where the original word rendered *festival* is *heortee* every time. And this is the word which Paul uses in Col. 2:16, thus carefully pointing out those old yearly festivals of the ceremonial law. No such festival is mentioned in the ten commandments; hence he has no reference to them.

"Or of the new moon." Anything about new moons in the ten commandments? Not a thing. Hence this can have no reference to that law. Was there a law touching the celebration of new

moons? Yes, the ceremonial law. See Num. 10:10; 28:11; Ps. 81:3, 4. Thus far we have not found the slightest reference to the ten commandments, but every item mentioned is found in the ceremonial law outside of the decalogue.

"Or of the sabbath days." Here our opponents are in high glee, thinking that the seventh-day Sabbath is surely meant by this; but we are as confident that it is not, and will give our reasons for it. Many of the ablest commentators agree with us in this. Dr. Clarke on this says: "The apostle speaks here in reference to some particulars of the *handwriting of ordinances*, which had been *taken away*, viz., the distinction of meats and drinks, what was clean and what unclean, according to the law; and the necessity of observing certain holidays or festivals, such as the new moons and particular sabbaths. . . . There is no intimation here that the Sabbath was done away, or that its moral use was superseded by the introduction of Christianity. I have shown elsewhere that *remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy*, is a command of perpetual obligation."

The American Tract Society comments thus on this passage: "A holy day—sabbath days; in the original, a festival—sabbaths. The days referred to are those required to be observed in meats, drinks, and new moons. The passage does not refer to the Sabbath of the moral law associated with the commands forbidding murder, theft, and adultery."

The following are some of the reasons why this does not apply to the weekly Sabbath:—

1. If it does, then it leaves us no weekly Sabbath day at all; for no exception is made. It

sets aside the first-day Sabbath as well as the seventh-day. Let no man judge you in respect to the sabbath days. If one man is not to be judged for disregarding one day, then another is not to be judged for disregarding another day, and so we need keep no day.

2. This interpretation contradicts the many plain and direct texts which assert that the law which includes the Sabbath is still in force and must be kept, even to the smallest point. Rom. 3:31; Matt. 5:17-19; Jas. 2:8-12.

3. If this proves the Sabbath nailed to the cross, then the other commandments went with it, and so the law against murder, adultery, theft, &c., has been abolished.

4. Not a single expression in the whole passage, unless it be this one touching the sabbath days, is applicable to the law of God engraven in stones, as we have seen.

5. Every item in the context, enumerated by the apostle, viz, meats, drinks, festivals, and new moons, is found, not in the decalogue, but in the ceremonial law. This is a strong indication that he is simply talking of the institutions of that ceremonial law, and has no reference to the moral law.

6. But were there any sabbath days in the ceremonial law? Yes; several yearly sabbaths, distinct from the Lord's Sabbath, which was the only weekly Sabbath. They are described at length in Lev. 23. We will notice a few of them:—

Verse 24: "In the seventh month, in the first day of the month, shall ye have a sabbath, a memorial of blowing of trumpets, an holy convocation. Ye shall do no servile work therein." This

sabbath was on the first day of the seventh month, which could only come once a year, as all can see.

Verses 27-32: "Also on the tenth day of this seventh month there shall be a day of atonement. . . . It shall be unto you a sabbath of rest, and ye shall afflict your souls; in the ninth day of the month at even, from even unto even, shall ye celebrate your sabbath." The Greek word here rendered sabbath, is *sabbaton*, the same that is used by Paul in Col. 2:16. This sabbath was on the tenth day of the seventh month, and so could come only once a year. The first and tenth days of the month were sabbaths, which shows that they are not weekly Sabbaths; for they are ten days apart—rather a long week!

Verse 39: "Also in the fifteenth day of the seventh month, when ye have gathered in the fruit of the land, ye shall keep a feast unto the Lord seven days; on the first day [of the feast, hence the fifteenth of the month] shall be a sabbath, and on the eighth day shall be a sabbath." Here we have two more yearly sabbaths. That these are not weekly Sabbaths is further proved by the fact that the tenth and fifteenth days of the month were sabbaths—a week only five days long! Further, the Lord says these are to be kept besides his Sabbath.

Verses 37, 38: "These are the feasts of the Lord which ye shall proclaim to be holy convocations, to offer an offering made by fire unto the Lord, a burnt-offering and a *meat* offering, a sacrifice, and *drink* offerings, everything upon his day; besides the Sabbaths of the Lord."

Thus we have the fact plainly before us that there were several yearly sabbaths connected with meats, drinks, new moons, feasts, &c. All

these were besides God's Sabbath, and this is the very list which Paul names in Col. 2 as nailed to the cross and blotted out.

7. Paul is very careful to designate which sabbath days were done away. He says, "The sabbath days *which are a shadow of things to come.*" Verse 17. This was true of the ceremonial sabbaths, but not of the seventh-day Sabbath. It pointed back to creation, not forward to the cross; hence it is not what the apostle meant.

But, says one, *days* is a supplied word in Col. 2:16. So the original would read, "Or of the Sabbath," singular number, hence *the* Sabbath, the seventh day, and not the sabbath days, the yearly sabbaths, plural. I answer, It is true that "*days*" is not in the original, but *sabbaton* is in the plural; hence if we do not render it *sabbath days*, we must render it sabbaths, plural, which is the same in substance. So our opponents have not even a single hook upon which to hang their theory in this passage, but we have strong proof here of our position on the two laws.

HEBREWS.

The book of Hebrews plainly teaches that a law was abolished by the introduction of the gospel, and it as plainly shows this to be the one relating to the priesthood, sacrifices, temple service, &c. Thus Paul says, "For the priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity a change also of the law." Chap. 7:12. What law was changed? The one relating to the priesthood. Did the ten commandments say anything about the priesthood? Not a word. Then that is not the law spoken of. The next verses explain the matter. "For he [Jesus] of whom these

things are spoken pertaineth to another tribe, of which no man gave attendance at the altar. For it is evident that our Lord sprang out of Juda, of which tribe Moses spake nothing concerning priesthood." Verses 13, 14.

The law referred to, then, is the law which Moses gave regulating the service of the altar, and the priesthood. This law limited the priesthood to the tribe of Levi. But Jesus was of the tribe of Judah; hence, before he could be a priest, that law must be done away.

Paul continues: "And it is yet far more evident; for that after the similitude of Melchisedec there ariseth another priest, who is made, not after the law of a *carnal* commandment, but after the power of an endless life." Verses 15, 16. The law here mentioned, then, related to carnal, or fleshly, ordinances. In Chap. 9:10, Paul thus describes it: "Which stood only in meats and drinks, and divers washings and *carnal* ordinances (margin, rites, or ceremonies,) imposed on them until the time of reformation." This so unmistakably points out the added law, or the ceremonial law, that I cannot conceive how a candid man can fail to see it.

This text affirms that there was a law which related to nothing but "meats and drinks, and divers washings, and carnal ordinances." Chap. 9:10. Notice how strong the language is: "Which stood **ONLY** in meats and drinks," &c. Then it did not relate to moral duties. But the decalogue related wholly and only to moral duties; hence it is not included in the law which related only to meats, drinks, washings, &c. Here again the two laws stand out plainly. The law spoken of in Hebrews is said to be a "*carnal*"

law, chap. 7:16, relating only to "*carnal ordinances*." Chap. 9:10. But, speaking of the moral law, Rom. 7:7, Paul says, "We know that the law is spiritual." Verse 14. Can the same law be both spiritual and carnal? Of course not. Then there must have been two laws. Of this carnal law Paul further says, "For the law made nothing perfect, but the bringing in of a better hope." Heb. 7:19. The word "*did*" is improperly supplied, and obscures the meaning. The Levitical law made nothing perfect. It only served to bring us to a better hope—the gospel, as expressed in the margin. But the psalmist declares that "the law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul." Ps. 19:7. Here again two laws are plainly contrasted.

Paul says this carnal law was "*imposed* on them until the time of reformation." This language is very similar to what we have all along found applied to the law of ordinances. Ezekiel says it was given because of their sins, was "not good," nor could they live by it. Chap. 20:24, 25. Peter denominates it "a yoke . . . which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear." Acts 15:10. In Gal. 3:19, it is said to have been "added because of transgressions, till the seed should come." In Eph. 2:15, it is called the "enmity," and in Col. 2:14, "that was against us." Heb. 10:1, says, "For the law having a shadow of good things to come, and not the very image of the things, can never with those sacrifices which they offered, . . . make the comers thereunto perfect." It is, then, the law relating to sacrifices and shadows of things to come which was done away. But there is not a word in the ten

commandments about sacrifices or anything of that nature.

The reader cannot fail to notice that in every passage where anything is said about the passing away of the law, reference is made to circumcision, sacrifices, the priesthood, or something like that, but never even an allusion to the law against murder, adultery, theft, &c. This is an important fact. If the decalogue and the moral precepts growing out of it are abolished, why does it not plainly say so somewhere? It is strange that not one direct reference to the moral law can be found in all the texts relating to the abolition of the law, if that law is the one that was done away.

THE MORAL LAW NOT ABOLISHED.

We will now briefly examine what is said of the law of God. The psalmist says, "The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul." Ps. 19:7. Coming from a perfect God, we should naturally expect it to be perfect. Of the extent of this law we read, "Let us hear the conclusion of the whole matter: Fear God, and keep his commandments; for this is the whole duty of man." Eccl. 12:13. The requirements of God's law extend to every moral duty of man. The decalogue is, of course, but a brief epitome of these duties, while all the moral precepts of the Old Testament and of the New also are but the further explanation of it, and continue in force with it. Of this law the Lord says, "I gave them my statutes, and showed them my judgments, which, if a man do, he shall even live in them." Eze. 20:11.

Speaking of the effect of Christ's mission upon

the law, the prophet says, "He will magnify the law and make it honorable." Isa. 42:21. Did he magnify the law by abolishing it? Did he make it honorable by doing it away? No, indeed. Listen to his own words as he shows how his coming was to affect the law: Matt. 5:17-28: "Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets." He is careful at the very opening of his ministry to disclaim any intention of destroying the law. "I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill." To fulfill is to keep. Gal. 6:2: "Bear ye one another's burdens, and so fulfill the law of Christ." Is a law ended when it is fulfilled? Then the law of Christ was abolished in the apostles' time. No; to fulfill a law is to keep it. See also Rom. 2:25-27; James 2:8-12. So Jesus came to obey the law, not to break or abolish it.

That it is the ten commandments of which he is speaking, he shows by quoting two of them to illustrate what he means: Verses 21, 27: "Thou shalt not kill," and "Thou shalt not commit adultery." Where are these words to be found? Nowhere in all the Old Testament except in the decalogue. Hence it is certain that this is the law of which he is speaking.

Of this law he further says: "For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled." Verse 18. Jesus uses two "tills" to mark how long the law will stand. 1. "Till heaven and earth pass," and 2. "Till all be fulfilled." Certainly we have not yet reached the time when the first "till" has expired; for heaven and earth have not yet passed away. But the second "till" reaches beyond the first

one. "Till *all* be fulfilled" includes the prophets as well as the law, for he is speaking of both. I have not come to destroy the law or the prophets. Hence the law will continue till all the prophets are fulfilled. But this will reach beyond the passing away of heaven and earth, even into the eternal state; for many of the prophets speak of that time. This is the strongest possible manner of teaching the immutable nature of that law. Hence in the next verse Jesus draws this conclusion: "Whosoever *therefore* [in view of what I have just said of this law] shall break one of these least commandments [those just referred to—the ten commandments], and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of Heaven; but whosoever shall do and teach them, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of Heaven." Verse 19. Obedience, then, to those commandments is a condition of entering the kingdom of Heaven.

Jesus then takes two of those commandments and comments on them to show how broad their application is: "Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, Thou shalt not commit adultery; but I say unto you, That whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her, hath committed adultery with her already in his heart." Does he abolish that commandment? He does that which is just the opposite: he shows that it extended further than to the outward act. He simply states what had always been true of it, though not explained so clearly before. Thus he magnified the law and made it honorable. How different this language is from that which we have found used when the ceremonial law was

spoken of! So we shall find it all the way through.

Christ, in his answer to the young man, exalts the ten commandments as the standard of character, and teaches that obedience to them is necessary to gain eternal life. "And, behold, one came and said unto him, Good Master, what good thing shall I do that I may have eternal life? And he said unto him, Why callest thou me good? there is none good but one, that is, God. But if thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments. He saith unto him, Which? [Evidently the young man knew that there were two laws, the moral and the ceremonial; hence he asked, Which?] Jesus said, Thou shalt do no murder, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear false witness, Honor thy father and thy mother, and, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." Matt. 19:16-19.

Jesus quoted directly from the decalogue five of the ten commandments, those relating to our duty to our neighbor; and then, as the sum of all these, he quotes from Lev. 19:18, the second great commandment, upon which they all hang. Matt. 22:36-40. He makes no reference to any part of the law of ordinances, thus showing that it is not a standard of character. It was not necessary that Jesus should quote the entire decalogue in order to indicate which law the young man must keep. He must keep that law of which these commandments are a part. Thus highly does Christ exalt this law in his teachings in the New Testament.

A groundless objection is here raised to the Sabbath, thus: Jesus did not say a word about the Sabbath precept; hence it need not be kept.

But neither did he say a word about the first, second, or third commandments forbidding idolatry, images, and profanity. Therefore these are not binding, and men can have other gods, worship images, and swear, with impunity! But we know that this is false, and so is the argument against the Sabbath. The truth is, Jesus simply quoted a part of the law to point out which one he meant.

Every time the decalogue, or any one of the ten commandments, is mentioned in the New Testament, it is honored, exalted, and enforced; while, on the other hand, the law of ordinances is always spoken of as being of no further importance. Notice a few examples. When the Pharisees asked Jesus why he transgressed the tradition of the elders in not washing his hands before eating, he said unto them, "Why do ye also transgress the commandment of God by your tradition? For God commanded, saying, Honor thy father and mother; and, He that curseth father or mother, let him die the death. But ye say, Whosoever shall say to his father or his mother, It is a gift, by whatsoever thou mightest be profited by me, and honor not his father or his mother, he shall be free. Thus have ye made the commandment of God of none effect by your tradition. Ye hypocrites! well did Esaias prophesy of you, saying, This people draweth nigh unto me with their mouth, and honoreth me with their lips; but their heart is far from me. But in vain they do worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men." Matt. 15:1-9.

Jesus quoted the fifth commandment and then severely reproveth the Pharisees for making this

void. He says that all their other worship is in vain as long as they disregard these commandments. Here again Jesus guards obedience to this law as the condition of favor with God. Nor does he give this as some new law of his own, but quotes it as what "God commanded" in the past.

So again when the lawyer asked him which was the greatest commandment in the law, "Jesus said unto him, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the first and great commandment. And the second is like unto it, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets." Matt. 22:37-40.

Jesus quotes these commandments word for word from the Old Testament, the first from Deut. 6:5, and the second from Lev. 19:18. And these are a part of the moral precepts. How highly Jesus exalts them; how plainly he teaches that they are still to be observed. But he says not one word about observing any of the typical law.

Now listen to Paul upon the same subject in his letter to the Romans. That it is the ten commandments, the law which the Jews received, is clear. Chap. 2:17-27: "Behold, thou art called a Jew, and retest in the law," "being instructed out of the law." The Jews never received Christ nor his teachings, hence this refers to the old law which they all received. Paul then refers to four of the ten commandments, thus putting it beyond doubt as to what law he is speaking of. "Thou that preachest a man should not steal, dost thou steal? [the eighth

commandment] thou that sayest a man should not commit adultery, dost thou commit adultery? [the seventh commandment] thou that abhorrest idols, dost thou commit sacrilege? [the first commandment] . . . for the name of God is blasphemed [the third commandment] among the Gentiles through you, as it is written."

The old law of ten commandments, then, is the one under consideration by Paul as late as A. D. 60, some 30 years after the resurrection. What does he say of it? "For circumcision verily profiteth, if thou keep the law; but if thou be a breaker of the law, thy circumcision is made uncircumcision. [If your circumcision helps you to keep this moral law, so far it is profitable; but if you break the moral law, your observance of the ceremonial law amounts to nothing.] Therefore, if the uncircumcision [the uncircumcised Gentile Christians] keep the righteousness of the law, shall not his uncircumcision be counted for circumcision? And shall not uncircumcision which is by nature, if it fulfill the law, judge thee, who by the letter and circumcision dost transgress the law?" Here Paul states that if the uncircumcised Gentiles will keep the law of which he has spoken, they will be accepted and will judge and condemn the Jews who are circumcised, but do not keep that law. Several important conclusions necessarily follow from the above argument of the apostle.

1. The law of ten commandments does extend to Gentiles.

2. We can keep it acceptably to God without being circumcised.

3. It is entirely distinct and separate from the ceremonial law; for a man can keep the ceremo-

nial law and yet break this law; or he can keep this law of ten commandments and still entirely disregard the law of ordinances. But if circumcision and the decalogue were only different parts of the same law, then a neglect of circumcision would be a violation of the law as a whole; for James correctly says, "Whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all." Chap. 2:10. But as Paul distinctly declares that a man can disregard the law of circumcision and still acceptably keep the law of ten commandments, they are not parts of the same law, but are two separate laws. This alone would fully establish our position on the two laws.

4. Notice how little importance is attached to circumcision, but how much is placed upon the keeping of the precepts of the decalogue.

Paul also states that this law is founded in nature itself. Thus: "For when the Gentiles, which have not the law [never had it written out in a book as the Jews had], do by nature the things contained in the law, these, having not the law, are a law unto themselves; which show the work of the law written in their hearts." Rom. 2:14, 15. And, finally, Paul concludes his argument on the decalogue thus: "Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid; yea, we establish the law." Chap. 3:31.

Here we take our stand. The apostle's statement is positive, clear, and decisive. The law is not abolished. Here, also, we have overwhelming evidence that there were two laws in the Old Testament, one of which was abolished by the gospel, and another which was not. Compare this with Eph. 2:15: "Having abolished in his

flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances." In this text Paul squarely states that Jesus did abolish a certain law. The Greek word here rendered abolished is *katargeo*, the very same one that is rendered "make void" in Rom. 3:31. So Paul in Rom. 3:31 says the law is not abolished and in Eph. 2:15 says as pointedly that the law is abolished. If there was only one law, this would be a square contradiction. But the context makes it all plain. In Rom. 2 and 3 Paul is treating of the moral law of ten commandments, while in Eph. 2 he is speaking of "the law of commandments contained in ordinances." See verse 15.

What do our opponents do with these stubborn facts? Just nothing. They pass them in silence.

In Rom. 7, Paul again refers to the ten commandments. Verse 7: "I had not known lust, except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet." This is a quotation from the tenth commandment, showing what law he means. Of this law he says, verse 12, "Wherefore the law is holy, and the commandment holy, and just, and good." How could he exalt that law in higher terms than this? Nor does he say that it used to be holy, but he says, "the law is holy." It was still holy, just, and good, when he was writing, thirty years after the resurrection. Again he says of it, verse 14, "For we know that the law is spiritual." Again, verse 22, "For I delight in the law of God after the inward man." Could Paul have said all this of an old abolished law, which at the best was a yoke of bondage, which was against us, and contrary to us? No, indeed.

Once more he appeals to the ten command-

ments to enforce brotherly love, thus: "Owe no man anything, but to love one another; for he that loveth another hath fulfilled the law. [What law? Answer:] For this, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not kill, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear false witness, Thou shalt not covet; and if there be any other commandment [relating to your duty toward your neighbor, the subject of which he is treating], it is briefly comprehended in this saying, namely, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. Love worketh no ill to his neighbor; therefore love is the fulfilling of the law." Rom. 13:8-10. Here are quoted in order five of the ten commandments. Then he quotes, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself," which, he says, briefly comprehends them all. Thus Paul honors the law of ten commandments, and enforces it upon Christians. So it always is in every reference which is made to that law in the New Testament.

In 1 Cor. 7:19, the apostle again shows a marked distinction between the two laws. "Circumcision is nothing, and uncircumcision is nothing, but the keeping of the commandments of God." That is, the keeping of the ceremonial law or its neglect amounts to nothing, but the important thing is to keep God's commandments.

The testimony of James in favor of the ten commandments is plain and strong. Chap. 2:8-12: "If ye fulfill the royal law [royal, kingly, the law of the Great King] according to the scripture, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself, ye do well." It requires love to fulfill the law, hence in keeping it we must remember this principle: "But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as trans-

gressors. For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all." Now he will show of what law he is speaking: "For he that said [margin, that law which said], Do not commit adultery, said also, Do not kill. Now, if thou commit no adultery, yet if thou kill, thou art become a transgressor of the law." Here James quotes the sixth and seventh of the ten commandments, the only law which says what he here quotes. Thus he directly enforces that law, and all of it, too, for he says that whoever keeps the whole of that law and yet offends in one point is guilty of all. Then the whole ten are binding and must be kept. Hence he adds: "So speak ye, and so do, as they that shall be judged by the law of liberty." Then men will be judged by this law in the Judgment. It is properly called "the law of liberty," because those who keep it are not condemned, but are free from sin. Thus David says, "I will walk at liberty; for I seek thy precepts." Ps. 119:45.

John also says, "This is the love of God, that we keep his commandments." 1 John 5:3. Describing the saints who live at the second advent, the Lord says, "Here are they that keep the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus." Rev. 14:12. The faith of Jesus embraces the gospel, the teachings of Christ. The commandments are those of God the Father—his moral law, the ten commandments. And, finally, in the very last revelation we have from Jesus, which we find in Rev. 22:14, he especially mentions his Father's commandments, and pronounces a blessing upon those who keep them. "Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they

may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city."

Thus we see that whenever the ten commandments are mentioned, or any one of them, either by Jesus or his apostles, they are always praised, exalted, and enforced. That law is held up as the standard of life, the test of character, and the rule of judgment.

That the reader may appreciate more forcibly the contrast between the two laws, I will here draw up a table of comparison between what is said of the great moral law of God as summarily contained in the ten commandments, but including their various branches, the moral precepts of the Old Testament as well as of the New, and what is said of the law of types as given through Moses. The moral law we will call Number 1, and the ceremonial law Number 2.

THE TWO LAWS COMPARED.

- | | | |
|---|---|--|
| 1 | { | Number 1—Existed in Eden, before the fall. |
| | { | Number 2—Was given after the fall. |
| 2 | { | Number 1—Was violated in the transgression which caused the fall. Gen. 3 : 6. |
| | { | Number 2—Was given in consequence of that transgression of No. 1. Gal. 3 : 19. |
| 3 | { | Number 1—Relates only to moral duties. Ex. 20 : 1-17, etc. |
| | { | Number 2—Is wholly ceremonial, pointing to the promised seed. Heb. 9 : 10. |
| 4 | { | Number 1—Was spoken by God from Heaven. Deut. 4 : 12. |
| | { | Number 2—Spoken by Moses. Deut. 1 : 1-6. |

- | | | |
|---|---|---|
| 5 | { | Number 1—Was written by God. Ex. 31 : 18. |
| | { | Number 2—Was written by Moses. Deut. 31 : 9. |
| 6 | { | Number 1—Was engraved upon stone. Deut. 4 : 13. |
| | { | Number 2—Was written in a book. Deut. 31 : 24. |
| 7 | { | Number 1—Was placed in the ark. Deut. 10 : 5. |
| | { | Number 2—Was put in the side of the ark. Deut. 31 : 26. |
| 8 | { | Number 1—Was "right," "true," and "good." Neh. 9 : 13. |
| | { | Number 2—Was "not good." Eze. 20 : 25. |
| 9 | { | Number 1—Was a law "which if a man do, he shall even live in" it. Eze. 20 : 11. |
| | { | Number 2—Was a law whereby they should "not live." Eze. 20 : 25. |

How could these possibly be the same law ?

- | | | |
|----|---|---|
| 10 | { | Number 1—Was perfect. Ps. 19 : 7. |
| | { | Number 2—Made nothing perfect. Heb. 7 : 19. |
| 11 | { | Number 1—Christ did not come to destroy. Matt. 5 : 17. |
| | { | Number 2—He abolished. Eph. 2 : 15. |
| 12 | { | Number 1—Is to endure while heaven and earth stand. Matt. 5 : 18. |
| | { | Number 2—Passed away when the seed came. Gal. 3 : 19. |

- 13 { Of Number 1 Christ said, "Whosoever, therefore, shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of Heaven." Matt. 5:19.
- 13 { Of Number 2 the apostles said, "We gave no such commandment" that "ye should keep the law." Acts 15:24.
- 14 { Number 1—Is "the law of liberty." Jas. 2:12.
- 14 { Number 2—Is a "yoke of bondage." Gal. 5:1.
- 15 { Number 1—The apostle delighted in. Rom. 7:22.
- 15 { Number 2—Was a yoke which could not be borne. Acts 15:10.
- 16 { Number 1—Is not abolished, but established, by faith. Rom. 3:31.
- 16 { Number 2—Was abolished by the cross. Eph. 2:15.

How could the same law be abolished, and not abolished, at the same time?

- 17 { Number 1—Is "spiritual." Rom. 7:14.
- 17 { Number 2—Is "carnal." Heb. 7:16.

Can the same law be both spiritual and carnal at the same time? Yes, if white is black, and black is white.

- 18 { Number 1—Is "holy," and "just, and good." Rom. 7:12.
- 18 { Number 2—Is called "the enmity," "that was against us, which was contrary to us." Col. 2:14.

- 19 { Number 1—Contains the whole duty of man. Eccl. 12:13.
- 19 { Number 2—"Stood only in meats and drinks, and divers washings, and carnal ordinances." Heb. 9:10.
- 20 { Number 1—Was written by nature in the heart of the Gentiles. Rom. 2:14.
- 20 { Number 2—Was a wall of partition between Jews and Gentiles. Eph. 2:14, 15.
- 21 { Number 1—Was "the royal law." Jas. 2:8.
- 21 { Number 2—Was the law of Moses. Acts 15:10.
- 22 { Number 1—Jesus came to magnify and make honorable. Isa. 42:21.
- 22 { Number 2—He disannulled. Heb. 7:18.
- 23 { Number 1—Is to be kept with the faith of Jesus. Rev. 14:12.
- 23 { Number 2—Is superseded by the faith of Jesus. Gal. 3:19-25.
- 24 { Number 1—Must be kept as a condition of entrance into eternal life and paradise. Matt. 19:16-19; Rev. 22:14.
- 24 { Number 2—Is not a standard of character. Rom. 2:25-27.
- 25 { Number 1—Is the law by which the world will be judged. Jas. 2:12; Eccl. 12:13, 14.
- 25 { Number 2—Will judge no man. Col. 2:16.

This last might be greatly extended, but the above points of contrast are sufficient to show

that all inspired writers have recognized and noted the distinction between the two laws, the moral and ceremonial.

ABSURDITIES OF THE POSITION

THAT THERE WAS BUT ONE LAW IN THE OLD TESTAMENT, WHICH ORIGINATED AT THE TIME OF MOSES, AND ENDED AT THE CROSS.

There are many great absurdities involved in the position that God's moral law was first given at Sinai, extended only to the Jews, and died at the cross to make way for a new law of Christ.

1. If this position be true, then there was no law against idolatry, profanity, murder, &c., till the time of Moses.

2. Those who take this position cannot show where God ever gave any law to the Gentiles, or made any claims upon them. But is he not the God of the Gentiles as well as of the Jews? Yes, for so Paul expressly says. Rom. 3:29. Is God a respecter of persons? Why then did God select the Israelites, and give them his law? Simply because all other people had turned away from God, and did not care for his law.

3. Those who deny the pre-eminence which we claim for the decalogue can give no reason why the Lord singled out the ten commandments, and gave them in so conspicuous a manner as he did. All God's acts are in wisdom and for a purpose. It was not by accident that he singled out and gave the decalogue as he did. Evidently, he did it to honor that law above all others.

4. The one-law position makes no distinction

between moral and ceremonial precepts. It jumbles them all together, while the Lord has everywhere made a marked distinction between them.

5. This position is guilty of the horrible assumption that the all-wise God has to amend, alter, and abolish his moral laws as men do human laws. Why should God abolish a moral precept? The thought is blasphemous. We claim that not a single moral precept of the Old Testament has been done away.

6. The position stated at the head of this division of the subject, teaches that all the ten commandments were abolished at the cross, and nine of the ten re-enacted at the same instant!

7. Of course this must have been done simply to get rid of the Sabbath, as the law would have been all right, but for that.

8. Or, as some claim, the law was abolished at the cross, and re-enacted at Pentecost, which leaves an interregnum of fifty days without any law at all. "Where no law is, there is no transgression." Rom. 4:15. All the crimes committed during those fifty days must go unpunished, as there was no law to condemn them!

9. God himself came down from Heaven and solemnly delivered his law. Then he sent his Son to abolish it!

10. Christ came to die for the law, and in the very act of dying for it, killed the law itself!

11. No person can be executed under two laws at the same time. Hence, if Christ died for the old law, he did not at the same time die for his new law. Or, if he died for his new law, then he could not have died for the old law, his Father's law. Therefore, either those under the old law or those under the new law have no Saviour,

and must be lost. This is an important point, we urge it upon the attention of our opponents.

12. Our opponents teach that Christ died for his own law before that law existed and before any one had transgressed it, thus making provision for sin.

13. It makes the Son the lawgiver, and leaves the Father out entirely. Hence we need an advocate with Christ. If Jesus is our lawgiver, and we are under his law, then if we break that law, against whom do we sin? The lawgiver, of course, who is Christ. Then we need an advocate with the offended lawgiver, Jesus. Who is this advocate? Is it the pope? the Virgin Mary? or whom? But John says, "If any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous." 1 John 2:1. This shows that it is the Father's law against which we offend, when we sin.

14. It makes Christ an advocate between us and his own law, a most palpable absurdity.

15. The world was in rebellion against the law of the Father. God sent his Son to reconcile the world to himself. Says Paul, "God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself." 2 Cor. 5:19. But Christ abolished his Father's law and set up one of his own, thus becoming the greatest rebel of them all! But no; the grand object of the gospel is to reconcile men to God. 2 Cor. 5:20.

16. Men cannot be judged by an abolished law; hence all those before the cross will go free in the Judgment, having no law to condemn them. Will God judge the millions of Hebrews who lived from Moses to Christ by an old dead law which, according to our opponents, was always only a yoke of bondage, grievous to be borne? It

would be a violation of every principle of law. Thus I read in the *Decision of the Supreme Court of Iowa, 1862—Iowa Reports*, vol. xii. p. 311:—

"The general principle relied upon, independent of some statutory rule, is not controverted, that when a statute is repealed it must be considered as if it had never existed, except with reference to such parts as are saved by the repealing statute." This refers to the criminal code, not to the civil law. But our opponents claim that all God's law was abolished—no part saved. Hence it cannot be a rule in the Judgment.

17. It assumes that the decalogue has been abolished, when no record of its repeal can be found. Notice how carefully the record is made when even human laws are abolished:—

Law repealed. "Be it enacted by the General Assembly of the State of Iowa, That section 2498 of the Revision of 1860, be and the same is hereby repealed." Approved Feb. 7, 1870.—*Session Laws of the Thirteenth General Assembly of Iowa*, p. 112.

Let our opponents bring something like this for the repeal of God's law, and we will believe them.

18. Laws which are to decide the eternal destiny of billions of souls should be given in the plainest possible manner. They should not be left to inference and guess-work. Beyond dispute God did give one law—the decalogue. He delivered it in just that solemn, public, and definite manner that we would expect in so all-important a transaction.

But our opponents claim that Jesus gave a new code of laws in place of the old, yet they can

produce no record as to *when* it was given, *where* it was given, *how many* precepts it has, which is the *first* or the *last*, *who* gave it, *to whom* it was given, what its *penalty* is, *wherein* it differs from the old, or any other particular.

Of all documents, a law should be given in the plainest manner. But in what book, chapter, and verse is this new law to be found? Was it given during Christ's life? or was it at his death? or was it after his resurrection? Was it delivered in the temple, by the sea-side, or where? Has it only nine commandments now? or has it a dozen? Which is the first commandment? Was it given in private, or in public? to the disciples, or to the world? Surely, if this law has a real existence, all these questions ought to be easily answered. But the Bible reader knows that the New Testament is entirely silent upon all these questions. It neither knows nor says anything of such a new law.

19. When an attempt is made to find this new law, some of its precepts are found enacted during the life of Christ before the time it is claimed that the old law was abolished, thus having two moral laws relating to the same duties, in operation at the same time. How absurd such a position! But look at its unsoundness. It is claimed that the first great commandment is found in Jesus' answer to the lawyer, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart." But notice the record: "And, behold, a certain lawyer stood up, and tempted him, saying, Master, what shall I do to inherit eternal life? He said unto him, What is written in the law? how readest thou? And he answering said, Thou shalt love

the Lord thy God with all thy heart," &c. Luke 10:25-27.

(1) The question is an all-important one, What shall we do to gain eternal life? (2) Jesus, to whom it was propounded, had come into this world for the express purpose of solving that question and teaching the way to eternal life. (3) The Lord, in answer, directed the lawyer right back to "what is written in the law." (4) This cannot refer to a new law of Christ's, for none of the gospel was "written" till many years after, and it was the law with which the Jewish lawyer was familiar. (5) The words quoted by the lawyer are found in Deut. 6:5; Lev. 19:18, a part of the moral law as explained through Moses. These precepts were not given by Jesus, nor in the New Testament, but are found in the old law. (6) Jesus said, "Do this and thou shalt live." (7) If this was the new law now given for the first time, then the lawyer gave it to Jesus, and not Jesus to the disciples! This makes that wicked Jewish lawyer the lawgiver for the Christian church! So if we examine every text claimed by our opponents, we shall find no new law given by Christ, but only a confirmation of the old one.

20. Next, many of the precepts of this new law are found for the first time in the epistles of the apostles which were not written till thirty years, or more, after it is claimed the decalogue was abolished, thus leaving thirty years without any law against various sins. Thus the commandment against images is supposed to be found in this text: "Little children, keep yourselves from idols." 1 John 5:21. But this was written A. D. 90, some sixty years after the res-

urrection. If this is the time and the place, when and where, the law against images was first given, then there were sixty years without any law against idolatry! What a blasphemous position! Is it replied that this is not the law, but only a reference to it, showing that there was a law against idolatry? This yields the whole question, as it admits that this is not a law, but only a reference to it. But we demand that the law itself shall be found. This cannot be done in the New Testament; for it is not there, though there are innumerable references to it, but all pointing back to the Old Testament.

21. If the law is to be found in the sayings of the apostles, then God is not our lawgiver, but men are. But James says, "There is one law-giver." James 4:12. The apostles never claimed to give laws; they only expounded and taught the law as already existing.

22. Finally, upon the most important of all subjects, the giving of the law of Jehovah, by which the eternal destiny of our race is to be decided, it leaves us to mere inference and guess-work.

A theory which involves so many and so great absurdities must be a very bad one.

THE OLD TESTAMENT ALWAYS APPEALED TO BY
THE NEW TESTAMENT WRITERS TO
ENFORCE THEIR TEACHINGS.

The following facts have an important bearing upon the question of the abolition of the law. The reader should not pass them over lightly.

1. *It is absurd to suppose that the Lord would abolish any moral precept.* Yet this is what our opponents have to maintain who contend that all

the laws of the Old Testament were abolished. In Deut. 6:5, we have this precept: "And thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might." Talk of abolishing such a precept. No; not while the throne of God stands.

Or take this one: "Thou shalt not defraud thy neighbor, neither rob him; the wages of him that is hired shall not abide with thee all night until the morning. Thou shalt not curse the deaf, nor put a stumbling-block before the blind, but shall fear thy God: I am the Lord. Ye shall do no unrighteousness in judgment; thou shalt not respect the person of the poor, nor honor the person of the mighty; but in righteousness shalt thou judge thy neighbor. Thou shalt not go up and down as a talebearer among thy people; neither shalt thou stand against the blood of thy neighbor: I am the Lord. Thou shalt not hate thy brother in thine heart; thou shalt in any wise rebuke thy neighbor, and not suffer sin upon him. Thou shalt not avenge, nor bear any grudge against the children of thy people, but thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself: I am the Lord." Lev. 19:13-18.

I maintain that the New Testament itself does not contain any better precepts than these; indeed there could be no better ones. Now, reader, in the name of common sense, why abolish such laws as these? Yet the Old Testament abounds in them from Genesis to Malachi. I maintain that not a single one of all the moral precepts of the Old Testament has been abrogated or set aside in any manner. No; they should be studied and obeyed by Christians now as they were by the men of God of old.

2. *The New Testament alone does not furnish sufficient instructions upon every moral duty.* We ask the especial attention of those to this point who talk so lightly against the Old Testament, and who maintain that the New Testament alone is a sufficient rule of faith and practice. This is a pernicious doctrine, everywhere condemned in the New Testament itself. Consider a few stubborn facts: Where is the New Testament law regulating marriage, telling whom we may marry and whom we may not? You may say it forbids adultery, but that is not enough. Is it wrong for me to marry my sister, my aunt, my daughter, my niece, &c.? Of course, you say, it is wrong; but where is your New Testament law against it? You have none. It says nothing about it. And why? Because this subject is fully treated of and explained in the Old Testament. See Lev. 18.

Again, there is no law in the New Testament regulating the observance of the Sabbath day. You must go to the Old Testament for that. Again, where is your law in the New Testament defining idolatry? You say it condemns idolatry. But what is idolatry? Further, where is your commandment in the New Testament against making and worshiping images? You have none. Again you must go to the Old Testament for this. Is it not wrong to take usury? Of course it is; and yet where is this forbidden in the New Testament? Nowhere. Is polygamy wrong? Of course it is; but where is this so-called New Testament law against that? It is not to be found. Here again you have to go to the Old Testament. You find it in Lev. 18:18; Deut. 17:17. Once more; is it not wicked for man

to lie with dumb beasts? In the Old Testament a law was given prohibiting it under the penalty of death. Ex. 22:19. But there is no such law in the New Testament.

A large number of such things might be mentioned in reference to which no law can be found in the New Testament, but upon which direct laws are found in the Old Testament. All admit these principles to be moral and highly important, and yet the New Testament is silent concerning them. What does this show? Simply this, that the New Testament does not, and does not claim to, supplant the Old, as a book of morals on all points. It constantly refers us to the Old Testament.

3. *The New Testament repeatedly enjoins upon us the duty of studying and obeying the Old Testament Scriptures.* This certainly would not be so if the Old Scriptures were abolished and the New contained all that was necessary for the Christian to know. Our divine Master said, "Search the Scriptures; for in them ye think ye have eternal life; and they are they which testify of me." "For had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me; for he wrote of me. But if ye believed not his writings, how shall ye believe my words?" John 5:39, 46, 47. To Timothy, Paul said, "And that from a child thou hast known the Holy Scriptures, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus. All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works." 2 Tim. 3:15-17.

What Scriptures had Timothy known from a child? Only the Old Testament Scriptures, because none of the New Testament was written when he was a child; and much of it was not written till after Paul wrote this to him. None will deny that the Scriptures here recommended are the Old Testament Scriptures. Notice carefully what Paul says of them. He affirms that these Scriptures are able to make a man wise unto salvation through faith in Christ; and further, they are profitable for reproof. But how could they reprove a man if they were no longer authority? Further, they are profitable for instruction in righteousness. Then their teachings must furnish some standard of righteousness, must be a law of righteousness. Lastly, he says they will thoroughly furnish the man of God unto all good works. These Scriptures fully justify all that we claim with regard to the Old Testament as being authority on Christian morality and good works. Read the following text: "For whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning, that we through patience and comfort of the Scriptures might have hope." Rom. 15:4.

The book of Acts abounds in proof upon this point. As the eunuch was reading the prophet Isaiah, it is said that Philip took the book and began at the same scripture and preached unto him Jesus. Acts 8:35. Then a man could preach the gospel from the Old Testament. Paul always opened the Old Testament Scriptures and argued from them. See Acts 17:2, and numerous places. Time would fail me to quote the passages upon this point.

4. *The Old Testament is always appealed to*

by New Testament writers to enforce their precepts. Jesus himself did this. He did not ignore the moral law of the Old Testament and set up a new standard of his own, but he appealed to it to justify his teachings. When Satan came to him with his temptations, he met him every time with, "It is written," and then quoted from the Old Testament. See Matt. 4:1-10. When he wished to rebuke the Pharisees for their sins, he quoted the fifth commandment from the decalogue. Matt. 15:1-9. When the young man came to him, asking what he should do to inherit eternal life, what did Jesus say? Did he give him some new law of his own? By no means; but he said to him, "If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments," and then he quoted five precepts from the old law of the decalogue. Matt. 19:16-19. On another occasion a certain lawyer asked him, "Master, what shall I do to inherit eternal life? He said unto him, What is written in the law? how readest thou? And he answering said, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength, and with all thy mind; and thy neighbor as thyself. And he said unto him, Thou hast answered right; this do, and thou shalt live." Luke 10:25-28. Here Jesus refers him right back to the law in the Old Testament as the rule by which to gain eternal life. When Jesus was accused by the Pharisees of breaking the Sabbath, he appealed to Old Testament authority to justify what he did.

In the parable of the rich man and Lazarus he says, "They have Moses and the prophets; let them hear them." Luke 16:29. Jesus repeat-

edly said that he came not down from Heaven to do his own will, but the will of his Father. John 5:30; 6:38. And then he said, "Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of Heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in Heaven." Matt. 7:21. When the martyr Stephen was rebuking the Jews for their sins, he said to them, "Who have received the law by the disposition of angels, and have not kept it." Acts 7:53. This was their great sin—they had not kept God's holy law. Notice how Paul proceeds when he wishes to prove, not only the Jews, but also the Gentiles, to be sinners, and in need of Christ. He goes directly to the Old Testament to do it. Thus he says, "For we have before proved both Jews and Gentiles, that they are all under sin; as it is written, There is none righteous, no, not one; there is none that understandeth, there is none that seeketh after God. They are all gone out of the way, they are together become unprofitable; there is none that doeth good, no, not one." Rom. 3:9-12.

These scriptures were of authority, and did apply to the Gentiles as well as to the Jews in the year A. D. 60. In Rom. 7:7, he appeals directly to one of the ten commandments, saying that he had not known sin except the law had said, "Thou shalt not covet."

And again, wishing to teach children obedience to parents, how does he enforce it? By some New Testament precept? No, he appeals directly to the old law in the Old Testament: "Children, obey your parents in the Lord; for this is right. Honor thy father and mother; which is the first commandment with promise;

that it may be well with thee, and thou mayest live long on the earth." Eph. 6:1-3. This is the fifth commandment of the decalogue. It shows that Paul did regard that law as of authority, and to it he appealed to enforce his teachings.

Does he wish to teach women their duty? Again he appeals directly to the law. "Let your women keep silence in the churches; for it is not permitted unto them to speak; but they are commanded to be under obedience, as also saith the law." 1 Cor. 14:34.

Does he endeavor to inculcate brotherly love among Christian brethren by some New Testament law? No; he enforces it by a quotation from the old law of ten commandments. Thus he says: "Owe no man any thing, but to love one another; for he that loveth another hath fulfilled the law. For this, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not kill, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear false witness, Thou shalt not covet; and if there be any other commandment, it is briefly comprehended in this saying, namely, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. Love worketh no ill to his neighbor; therefore love is the fulfilling of the law." Rom. 13:8-10. Mark this point well. The old law is his source of appeal for his authority every time.

And so it was with all the apostles. When James reproved his brethren for pride, for disrespect to their poor brethren, he also appealed right to the old law to convince them of sin. Thus he says: "If ye fulfill the royal law according to the scripture, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself, ye do well; but if ye have

respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors. For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all. For he that said, Do not commit adultery, said also, Do not kill. Now if thou commit no adultery, yet if thou kill, thou art become a transgressor of the law." James 2:8-11.

To his brethren, John also wrote this: "Brethren, I write no new commandment unto you, but an old commandment which ye had from the beginning." 1 John 2:7. And again, "Whosoever committeth sin transgresseth also the law; for sin is the transgression of the law." 1 John 3:4.

Peter also held up to his brethren the Old Testament standard of holiness as the rule of their life. "But as he which hath called you is holy, so be ye holy in all manner of conversation; because it is written, Be ye holy; for I am holy." 1 Pet. 1:15, 16.

All these examples do clearly show that the New Testament writers never dreamed of discarding the Old Testament Scriptures, or of setting aside the law of God as authority. In the New Testament there are four hundred and fifty-nine direct quotations from the Old Testament, and five hundred and one references to it, as may be seen by any table of quotations. Would to God our modern religious teachers would follow this worthy example.

However plain any truth may be, objections can always be brought against it which can be made to appear quite plausible. Atheists urge objections against the existence of God which are not easily answered. Infidels have a thousand

objections to the Bible, and to the Christian religion, many of which are hard to answer. Pedobaptists are on hand with objections to immersion, and immaterialists have plenty of objections to the earth's becoming the saints' future inheritance.

Indeed, what doctrine has not been objected to? what truth not opposed? So with God's law. Though it is one of the plainest subjects in the Bible, yet men can devise objections against it. As long as there is the shadow of an argument in one of these, they are deaf and blind to the plainest and most direct proofs in favor of the law of God. What do they do with all the proofs supporting it? Generally, nothing. An objection or two fills their whole mind, and they can see nothing else. But the arguments brought are simply *objections*, nothing more, which can be fairly answered. We will now notice a few of these objections.

FIRST OBJECTION.—*Nine of the ten commandments are brought over into the New Testament; but the Sabbath, or fourth commandment, is not.*

Answer. This means that nine of the ten commandments are either repeated, re-enacted, or referred to in the New Testament, while the fourth is not. We will examine each point. Many, in their opposition to the Sabbath, carry the impression that all the commandments except the Sabbath are repeated word for word in the New Testament. But such is not the case. Neither the first, second, third, fourth, nor tenth commandments, are anywhere repeated in the New Testament. This is an important fact, as it shows that the New Testament does not give a new code of laws.

The other five commandments, with a part of the tenth, are quoted in the following passages in the New Testament: Matt. 5:21, 27; 15:4; 19:18, 19; Mark 7:10; 10:19; Luke 18:20; Rom. 7:7; 13:9; Eph. 6:2, 3; James 2:11. If, then, the Sabbath

is not now obligatory because that commandment is not directly quoted in the New Testament, then also the first three are not now binding, and it is no sin to have other gods, worship images, or profane God's name! To what a monstrous conclusion this theory leads! So it always will be found that every argument framed against the Sabbath comes with equal force against the other commandments.

But yielding the point that there are several others of the ten commandments, as well as the Sabbath, not quoted at all in the New Testament, our opponents next claim that there were nine of the ten commandments re-enacted in the New Testament, not, indeed, in the very words of the old law, but in substance the same. It is painfully amusing to see them try to find these commandments as thus re-enacted. Here is the mode generally adopted: First commandment, 1 John 5:21, "Keep yourselves from idols." How plain! But stop! When was this written? Not till A. D. 90, or about sixty years after the resurrection. Here, then, were sixty years before the first commandment was re-enacted—sixty years in which there was no law against idolatry! If, to evade this terrible conclusion, it is admitted that this passage does not bring to view the place where and the time when this commandment was re-enacted, but only a reference to it as already existing, then the whole point is given up. For thereby they admit that they have no record of the time when, or place where, this was re-enacted. It only shows that there was a law against idolatry and this is simply a reference to it as previously existing. Here they are compelled to admit the whole truth, and come squarely upon our ground. That commandment with the time and place of its enactment is nowhere to be found in the New Testament; but in the decalogue. Ex. 20:3.

But it puzzles them very much to find the second commandment re-enacted in the New Testament. Matt. 22:37, is generally quoted as the nearest to the point—"Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all

thy heart." If a man loves God with all his heart, he will not worship any image. But try that a little further. Would he have other gods? No. Then this includes the first commandment. Would he profane God's name? Certainly not. Would he violate God's holy rest-day? No. This then includes the fourth commandment as well as the first three, and so proves too much for our opponents.

But this language was spoken by Christ some time before his crucifixion, at which time they claim the old law was abolished. So they have a part of the law re-enacted before it is abolished! But the simple fact is, this is only a quotation by Christ from the Old Testament. The lawyer asked him which was the great commandment in "the law"—the law already existing, not a new law which Christ should give. In answer to this, Jesus quotes verbatim from Deut. 6:5, the great commandment to love God with all the heart, and from Lev. 19:18, the second, to love your neighbor as yourself. If, therefore, the giver of these two great commandments was to supersede the decalogue, then it must have passed away in the days of Moses, B. C. 1500!

Look at the places where the other commandments are claimed to be re-given. In Matt. 19:16-19, Jesus, in answer to the young man, quotes the fifth, sixth, seventh, eighth, and ninth commandments just as found in the decalogue.

This was no re-enactment of them, but simply a quotation from the law as already existing. This, too, was before they claimed the law abolished; so that Christ re-enacted these before he abolished them, if his be a re-giving of them!

So Paul, in Rom. 13:9, quotes five of the ten commandments. This also is seized on as a re-enactment of those commandments. But were they re-enacted both by Jesus and by Paul, and then again by James? Chap. 2:8-12. How can any candid man for a moment maintain such a position?

How plain is the simple fact that both Christ and the apostles were only quoting from the law before given by God the Father, than whom there could be no higher authority.

If it is claimed that nine are referred to while the fourth is not, this is false. The Sabbath is mentioned in the New Testament oftener than any other of the ten commandments, being not less than fifty-nine times in all. It is worthy of notice that in all these numerous references not one word is spoken derogatory to the honor and sacredness it had always possessed.

SECOND OBJECTION.—*Stoning to death, the penalty for breaking the law, has been abolished; and as a law without a penalty is of no force, therefore the law is void.*

Answer. Stoning to death never was the final penalty for the violation of the moral law. It was simply the penalty prescribed by the civil law of the Jews, the same as hanging or imprisonment is with us. A little reflection will show this. Suppose a Jew had murdered a man. For this he was arrested and stoned to death. Was that the penalty of the moral law? If so, as soon as he was dead, he had paid the penalty of the law, and could not, in justice, be made to pay it again. Hence, in the final Judgment this man would go clear of the second death! God would not judge, condemn, and punish him twice, for the same crime. So he would go straight into the kingdom! This is too absurd to be believed. No; the stoning penalty was simply that prescribed by the civil law of the land, the same as hanging is with us. But the real and final penalty for the violation of the moral law, has always been *death*—the second death. There has been no change in this penalty. It has always been the same in the Old and New Testaments. Eze. 18:20; Rom. 6:23. Those who knowingly violate God's law now will find, in the Judgment of the great day, that death is the penalty, the same as ever.

THIRD OBJECTION.—*We are justified by faith, and not by the works of the law.*

Answer. As there are several passages quoted on this point, I will transcribe them and answer them altogether. Rom. 1:17: "The just shall live by faith." Exactly the same words are quoted in Gal. 3:11, and in Heb. 10:38. Rom. 3:20: "Therefore by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in His sight; for by the law is the knowledge of sin." Verse 28: "Therefore we conclude that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law." Eph. 2:8: "For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves; it is the gift of God."

Many more passages to the same effect might be quoted, but these are some of the plainest. Our opponents quote these with a great flourish of trumpets, and try to make it appear that we are endeavoring to be justified, not by faith in Christ, but by keeping the law. Notwithstanding all our protests to the contrary and all our explanations, they still repeat this assertion, simply, it seems to us, because they can create a prejudice by it. When we urge them to keep God's commandments, they say, "We are not saved by keeping the law, but by faith in Christ. Do you think keeping the Sabbath will save a man?" We reply, Can a man be saved while he continues to break the law? Can a man continue to lie or murder, and still be justified and saved by faith? Certainly not. Well, then, if a man should keep those commandments against lying and murdering, would that save him? Certainly not. Then if he cannot be saved by keeping those precepts, why urge him to keep them? Simply because he cannot be saved unless he does keep them, and yet keeping them alone will not save him. A murderer cannot be saved; and yet simply refraining from murder, and keeping that commandment, will not save him. So of any part of the law, the Sabbath as well as the rest.

But the question is, Does justification by faith abol-

Center for Adventist Research
Andrews University
Berrien Springs, Michigan

ish the law and free us from keeping it? So it is claimed. Then the law was abolished 626 years before Christ by Habakkuk the prophet, for he said at that time, the same as Paul did after him, "The just shall live by his faith." Chap. 2:4. Paul only quotes this from him. But this is abolishing the law a little too soon, even for our opponents.

But let us come directly at the root of the matter. Why is it that the sinner is justified by faith, and not by the deeds of the law?

The answer is easy. A just and holy law requires perfect obedience all the time. Now if a person violates it once, it will immediately condemn him. Future obedience cannot atone for this; for nothing short of *perfect* obedience *all* the time will satisfy the law.

To illustrate: A kills a man. He passes on ten years undiscovered, during which time he carefully keeps the law. Now he is arrested and proved guilty. Will the law justify him for that murder because he has kept the law since he committed the murder? No, indeed, and why? Because he had no right to kill even one man. So we all, having broken the holy law of God, are justly all condemned by the law. Now, if we should keep the law ever so strictly in the future, it could not possibly wipe out those past sins. Hence it is that Christ had to die "for the remission of sins that are past." Rom. 3:25. Christ comes in to pardon and take away these past sins, which it is out of our power to remove or atone for. All who repent of these sins and believe in Jesus are offered pardon. This pardon is granted for Christ's sake, and not for our good deeds; for even the best are sinners.

Was there ever a time since the fall of Adam when a sinner could save himself by obedience to the law of God? Certainly not. Were not all men sinners before the time of Christ as well as since? Surely. Will not some of them be saved? Yes. How? By their good works? by keeping the law of God? No;

but by faith, faith in Christ. But did not these men before the coming of Christ have to keep the law of God, the ten commandments? We know they did.

Were they, then, justified by works? No, indeed. Take the case of Abraham as an illustration. Of him Paul says: "For if Abraham were justified by works, he hath whereof to glory, but not before God. For what saith the scripture? Abraham believed God, and it was counted unto him for righteousness." Rom. 4:2, 3. So we see that Abraham was justified by faith, and yet how carefully he kept the law. Gen. 26:5. If, therefore, the holy men in the old dispensation could be justified by faith and yet keep the commandments, so can we. Could they be saved and not keep them? All know they could not. If, then, faith did not free them from keeping the law, why will it free us from it? No; there is no reason nor Scripture for teaching that we need not keep the law because we are justified by faith and not by works.

So Paul, in Rom. 3, after strongly arguing that a man cannot be justified by the law, but only by faith, yet adds: "Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid; yea, we establish the law." Verse 31. Be it known then that we are not seeking justification from our sins by keeping the law, but only through faith in the divine Son of God. Yet we do not therefore claim a license to sin, to steal, lie, or murder, nor break the Sabbath either. Be careful, my friend, that you do not trample on one of God's commandments under the vain plea that you believe in Jesus; for he has said, "Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of Heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in Heaven." Matt. 7:21.

FOURTH OBJECTION.—*There is neither love nor mercy in the ten commandments.*

Answer. So say the opponents of God's holy law, but it is only another illustration of their ter-

rible blindness. Read the second commandment: "Showing *mercy* unto thousands of them that *love* me and keep my commandments." Ex. 20:6. Both love and mercy are specially mentioned in the law itself. After quoting the two great commandments, to love God with all the heart, and our neighbor as ourselves, Jesus says, "On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets." Matt. 22:40. Then, our Lord being judge, love is the principle upon which all the law rests. Every requirement of the law is founded in love, and it requires love on our part to fulfill the law. This Paul directly asserts. Rom. 13:8-10: "Owe no man anything but to love one another; for he that loveth another hath fulfilled the law. [What law? The decalogue, as he shows by immediately quoting five of the ten commandments.] For this, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not kill, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear false witness, Thou shalt not covet; and if there be any other commandment, it is briefly comprehended in this saying, namely, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. Love worketh no ill to his neighbor; therefore love is the fulfilling of the law." What is love? Let the inspired apostle answer. "*Love is the fulfilling of the law.*" Then the law does require love, and cannot be fulfilled without it. Indeed, this is love itself, to fulfill the law. But John puts the matter beyond all dispute: "For this is the love of God, that we keep his commandments." 1 John 5:3. What is the love of God? Answer, "That we keep his commandments." Is there then no love in the law? The man who will maintain such a position contrary to these plain, inspired declarations, must be willingly blind.

Love is not manifested simply by emotion, by feeling, by words; but the chief and truest manifestation of love is shown in obedience, in works. Hence, strict and cheerful obedience to the law of God is the highest proof of our love to him.

THE ADVENT KEEPSAKE; a daily text of Scripture on the Second Advent, etc. 25 cts.

SERMONS ON THE SABBATH AND LAW; embracing an Outline of the Biblical and Secular History of the Sabbath for 6000 years. By J. N. Andrews. 25 cts.

FACTS FOR THE TIMES; a Collection of Valuable Extracts from Eminent Authors. 30 cts.

HISTORY OF THE DOCTRINE OF THE IMMORTALITY OF THE SOUL By D. M. Canright. 25 cts.

THE STATE OF THE DEAD. By U. Smith. 224 pp., 25 cts.

OUR FAITH AND HOPE. Sermons on the Second Coming of Christ. By James White. 20 cts.

REFUTATION OF THE AGE TO COME. By J. H. W. 20 cts.

THE ATONEMENT. By J. H. Waggoner. 20 cts.

THE NATURE AND TENDENCY OF MODERN SPIRITUALISM. By J. H. Waggoner. 20 cts.

THE BIBLE FROM HEAVEN; a Dissertation. 20 cts.

MIRACULOUS POWERS. 20 cts.

THE MINISTRATION OF ANGELS; and the Origin, History, and Destiny of Satan. By D. M. Canright. 20 cts.

REFUTATION OF FORTY-FOUR SO-CALLED OBJECTIONS AGAINST THE ANCIENT SABBATH. By D. T. Bourdeau. 15 cts.

THE DESTINY OF THE WICKED. By U. Smith. 15 cts.

COMPLETE TESTIMONY OF THE FATHERS, concerning the Sabbath and First Day of the Week. By J. N. Andrews. 15 cts.

THE TWO LAWS as set forth in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments. By D. M. Canright. 15 cts.

THE MESSAGES OF REV. 14. By J. N. Andrews. 15 cts.

THE RESURRECTION OF THE UNJUST; a Vindication of the Doctrine. By J. H. Waggoner. 15 cts.

THE TEMPTATION OF CHRIST IN THE WILDERNESS. By Mrs. Ellen G. White. 15 cents.

THE SEVEN TRUMPETS; an Exposition of Rev. 8 and 9. 15 cts.

THE MORALITY OF THE SABBATH. By D. M. Canright. 15 cts.

THE SAINTS' INHERITANCE; or, The Earth Made New. By J. N. Loughborough. 10 cts.

THE SANCTUARY AND TWENTY-THREE HUNDRED DAYS. By J. N. Andrews. 10 cts.

SUNDAY SEVENTH-DAY EXAMINED. A Refutation of Mede, Jennings, Akers, and Fuller. By J. N. Andrews. 10 cts.

REVIEW OF BAIRD'S TWO SERMONS on the "Christian Sabbath." By J. H. Waggoner. 10 cts.

THE TRUTH FOUND; the Nature and Obligation of the Sabbath of the Fourth Commandment. By J. H. Waggoner. 10 cts.

REVIEW OF GILFILLAN, and other authors, on the Sabbath By T. B. Brown. 10 cts.

(See last page of cover.)